



**State of Michigan**  
John Engler, Governor

**Department of Consumer & Industry Services**  
Kathleen M. Wilbur, Director

**Office of Financial and Insurance Services**  
Frank M. Fitzgerald, Commissioner

P.O. Box 30220  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7720  
Toll Free (877) 999-6442  
Lansing Area (517) 373-0220  
Web site: [www.cis.state.mi.us/ofis](http://www.cis.state.mi.us/ofis)

## **MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** May 4, 2001

**TO:** The Liquor Control Commission, All Members of the House of Representatives Committee on Insurance and Financial Services and All Members of the Senate Committee on Financial Services

**FROM:** Frank M. Fitzgerald  
Commissioner of Financial and Insurance Services

**SUBJECT:** Liquor Liability Report

In accordance with 1986, P.A. 176 since April 1, 1988, all retail liquor licensees have been required to show proof of financial responsibility in amounts of \$50,000 or more in order to obtain or renew a liquor license. Proof of financial responsibility may take the form of a liquor liability insurance policy with a minimum aggregate limit of \$50,000. The requirement remains in effect subject to an annual study of the market and a determination by the Insurance Commissioner that this insurance is available in Michigan at a reasonable premium. Attached is the 2001 report and certification on the availability and pricing of liquor liability insurance in Michigan.

Since 1987, the liquor liability market has become increasingly competitive while at the same time the line has appeared to be very profitable. There are 225 companies currently providing this insurance to Michigan liquor licensees and this competition has resulted in a significant reduction of rates over the last thirteen years.

At the current time, this insurance appears reasonably available to all classifications of liquor licensees at a reasonable premium.

Attachment

**THE AVAILABILITY AND PRICING  
OF LIQUOR LIABILITY INSURANCE**

**A REPORT BY THE  
MICHIGAN COMMISSIONER OF  
FINANCIAL AND INSURANCE SERVICES**

DIVISION OF INSURANCE  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & INDUSTRY SERVICES

May 2001

# I

## INTRODUCTION

Since 1933, Michigan has regulated the sale of liquor, prohibiting the sale of liquor to minors and intoxicated persons. Liquor retailers which do so are subject to fines, loss of license, and liability for physical damage, injuries, and deaths caused by intoxicated persons they served. The liability for the illegal sale of liquor promotes care in the sale of liquor and facilitates the recovery of persons injured by the intoxicated person. To protect against these potential liabilities, liquor retailers typically purchase liquor liability insurance. This insurance covers the cost of defending liquor liability suits, settlements, and awards.

With the passage of 1986, PA 176, the availability and affordability of this insurance line became a public issue. Several of the enacted changes, such as earlier notice of claims, the last bar serving a person was presumptively where the person became visibly intoxicated, and elimination of suits by relatives of the intoxicated person, benefited liquor retailers. Requiring liquor retailers to show evidence of financial responsibility to obtain or renew their liquor licenses and stronger sanctions for dramshop act violations were intended to benefit the general public.

Beginning April 1, 1988, the dramshop act required liquor licensees to show proof of financial responsibility of at least \$50,000. Licensees typically meet this requirement by purchasing a liquor liability insurance policy. The Commissioner is required to complete an annual report and certify whether liquor liability insurance is available and reasonably priced. This is the 13th annual report meant to provide that market assessment.

### **Background on Market Conditions**

In 1985 and 1986, the liquor liability insurance market experienced the harsh side of the underwriting cycle. Rates were high, available sources were scarce, and many Michigan liquor retailers were "going bare," i.e., conducting business without insurance. In 1986, two surplus lines insurers dominated the liquor liability insurance market for "stand-alone" policies, writing 96.5% of the written premium. Frequent lawsuits and high damage awards hurt profitability, causing only a few insurers to write liquor liability insurance and for

small amounts in conjunction with a general liability policy.

During 1986, the market began to soften due, in part, to improved insurer profitability and actions of the Legislature and the Commissioner of Insurance. After holding a public hearing pursuant to Section 6506 of the Insurance Code of 1956, MCL 500.6506, the Commissioner of Insurance determined that liquor liability insurance was not readily available in Michigan at a reasonable premium. To reestablish a market, the Commissioner issued an order that allowed the formation of limited liability pools to issue liquor liability insurance policies.

In 1986, the Legislature passed the dramshop law revisions discussed above to reduce the number of lawsuits against liquor retailers. It also required liquor retailers to obtain liquor liability insurance (effective in 1988) subject to a determination by the Commissioner that liquor liability insurance in Michigan was available at a reasonable premium. This action automatically created a market for liquor liability insurance and ensured a means of compensating victims of drunk driving accidents. The dramshop law revisions caused insurers to anticipate a decline in the number of liquor liability lawsuits and damage awards in Michigan.

### **Public Hearings and Recommendations**

As a part of the former Insurance Bureau's study of the market to determine what to recommend to the Legislature on the mandatory insurance requirement for liquor retailers, a public hearing was held in October of 1987. At the hearing liquor retailers unanimously opposed the requirements. However, later Bureau studies showed that there were at least 21 insurers writing liquor liability coverage in Michigan, including two limited liability pools. The Bureau found that, based on estimated loss ratios, projected profits, and the closeness of the premium charges to expected losses, liquor liability insurance was available at a reasonable premium.

In spite of protests by many liquor retailers, the insurance requirement took effect on April 1, 1988. After that date, to obtain or renew a liquor license, retailers must provide proof of financial responsibility in the form of an insurance policy or bond of at least \$50,000. At public hearings held later in 1988, 61 retailers testified against the requirements.

In January of 1989, another public hearing was held to determine whether allowing formation of limited liability pools to issue liquor liability policies was still needed. Only a few insurance company representatives attended this hearing and no one testified. No liquor licensees attended the hearing, and, following the hearing, the former Insurance Bureau received no comment letters. Given the appearance that the market was adequately supplying this insurance, the Commissioner issued an order precluding the formation of any new limited liability pools for liquor liability insurance.

### **Current Market Conditions**

According to the Liquor Control Commission, in January of 2001, there were 225 insurers providing liquor liability coverage to 16,761 retail liquor establishments either through a liquor liability policy or by an endorsement on a commercial general liability insurance policy. Since the insurance requirement was enacted in 1988, many admitted insurers have entered the market, including two domiciled in Michigan, which insure significant numbers of licensees. As availability of coverage expanded, affordability of coverage has greatly improved.

Accompanying the expanded purchasing of insurance coverage has been the movement from insurers with high financial ratings to lesser-rated insurers. The addition of "Best's" ratings to the exhibits in the section on availability of insurance shows this trend. A. M. Best Company evaluates the condition of insurance companies and rates them accordingly. An explanation of the Best ratings can be found in Appendix I.

### **Mandated Considerations**

To assure that licensees can obtain the mandatory levels of coverage, Public Act 173 of 1986 requires the Commissioner of Insurance annually to issue a report in March detailing the state of the liquor liability insurance market and delineating specific classifications of liquor liability insurance where reasonable availability does not exist. If, based on this annual report, the Commissioner certifies that liquor liability insurance is not reasonably available, or is not available at a reasonable premium, the Liquor Control Commission is authorized to waive the requirement of proof of financial responsibility.

Rating information in this report is based on data submitted to the Division of Insurance by the companies specifically surveyed for this report. Liquor liability premium data are collected from Form FIS-0118, a supplemental form to each insurer's annual financial statement. A list of insurers with numbers of licensees insured is obtained from reports generated by the Liquor Control Commission.

Determining the availability and reasonableness of pricing of liquor liability insurance under Section 2409b(2) of the Insurance Code of 1956, MCL 500.2409b(2) (quoted in Appendix II), requires the Commissioner to consider specific aspects of the market. To this end, the law requires that the Commissioner evaluate the structure of the liquor liability market to ensure that no insurer controls the market and that there are enough insurers to provide multiple options to liquor licensees. The Commissioner must consider the disparity among liquor liability insurance rates and evaluate whether overall rate levels are excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory. The law also allows the Commissioner to examine other factors considered relevant.

## **II**

### **THE AVAILABILITY OF INSURANCE**

Market structure is a relevant factor in evaluating the availability of liquor liability insurance. Market

concentration, the number of carriers, and the turnover rate of market participants are examined using by-line data since 1980 and licensee data since 1988. The Insurance Division's Report on the State of Competition in the Commercial Liability Insurance Market contains an extensive discussion of the economic analysis of market structure.

### **Market Structure**

Exhibit A and Appendix A show written premiums, market shares of written premiums, loss ratios and Best's ratings from the given year for each of the 20 leading liquor liability insurance carriers for the period 1980 through 1999. These data are from a special annual report to the Division on the FIS-0118. Exhibit B provides a moving picture of the structure of the liquor liability insurance market. Exhibit B includes concentration measures, industry loss ratios, number of admitted carriers writing liquor liability insurance, percent of the market having surplus lines coverage and the percent of carriers that are A-rated by Best's Insurance Report. These exhibits provide a history of the important market participants and are the basis for reviewing concentration and turnover of the largest carriers in the market. Beginning in 1985, eligible surplus lines insurers are included and denoted with an "s."

The initial set of statistics in Exhibit B presents concentration ratios or the combined market shares of premiums written for the top 4, 8, and 20 carriers. A rough economic benchmark relating to concentration levels of the top 4 and 8 firms is that percentages exceeding 60% and 80%, respectively, may trigger designation as a concentrated market. The market structure, by the above benchmark, indicates a concentrated market throughout the period covered by the available data.

# Exhibit A

## Premiums, Market Shares, Loss Ratios and Best's Ratings of the Liquor Liability Insurance Market 1996 - 1997

<u>Year</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Carrier Name</u>	<u>Written Premiums (\$1,000s)</u>	<u>Market Shares (%)</u>	<u>Loss Ratio (%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1996	1.	North Pointe Insurance Company	9,308	47.25	4.78	B++
	2.	# MLBA Limited Liability Pool	1,723	8.74	25.65	NR3
	3.	@First Security Casualty Company	1,684	8.55	86.29	(3)
	4.	s Columbia Casualty Company	1,215	6.17	49.26	A
	5.	Legion Insurance Company	945	4.80	0.00	A
	6.	Citizens Insurance Co of America	693	3.52	-10.72	A+
	7.	s Mt. Vernon Fire Insurance Company	678	3.44	28.85	A++
	8.	Star Insurance Company	655	3.32	14.78	A-
	9.	Old Republic Insurance Company	610	3.10	0.25	A+
	10.	# Bowling Prop. of MI Lmted Liab. Pool	398	2.02	15.10	B+
	11.	Northwestern National Casualty Co	346	1.76	-4.35	B+
	12.	United States Fire Insurance Company	237	1.20	-8.35	A
	13.	Calvert Insurance Company	183	0.93	408.19	A
	14.	s St. Paul Surplus Lines Insurance Co	157	0.80	-309.19	A+
	15.	Illinois EMASCO Insurance Company	104	0.53	-4.33	A
	16.	Federated Mutual Insurance Company	97	0.49	-105.40	A
	17.	Transcontinental Insurance Company	96	0.49	60.09	A
	18.	St. Paul Mercury Insurance Company	60	0.30	-50.80	A+
	19.	Zurich Insurance Company USB	52	0.26	0.10	A+
	20.	United National Insurance Company	51	0.26	-60.37	A+
1997	1.	North Pointe Ins Co	9,753	53.31%	38.82	B++
	2.	# MLBA Limited Liability Pool	1,522	8.32%	(49.42)	NR1
	3.	Legion Insurance Co	1,249	6.83%	10.99	A
	4.	s Columbia Casualty Company	920	5.03%	56.85	A
	5.	Star Insurance Company	794	4.34%	23.09	A-
	6.	Citizens Insurance Co Of America	725	3.96%	1.14	A
	7.	s Mount Vernon Fire Insurance Co	646	3.53%	60.00	A++
	8.	Reliance Insurance Company	557	3.04%	0.00	A-
	9.	# Bowling Proprietors Of MI Ltd	396	2.16%	(41.38)	B+
	10.	Northwestern National Casualty Co	288	1.57%	540.51	B++
	11.	Employers Ins Of Wausau A Mutual Co	162	0.89%	0.00	A+
	12.	United States Fire Ins Co	159	0.87%	0.00	A-
	13.	Calvert Insurance Company	145	0.79%	78.55	A-
	14.	Firemans Fund Ins Co	121	0.66%	0.00	A
	15.	s St Paul Surplus Lines Ins Co	113	0.62%	(246.24)	A+
	16.	s Illinois EMASCO Insurance Co	107	0.58%	0.00	A
	17.	Transcontinental Insurance Co	92	0.50%	10.46	A
	18.	Federated Mutual Ins Co	81	0.44%	1,657.01	A+
	19.	Argonaut Great Central Ins Company	69	0.37%	0.00	A-
	20.	Home-Owners Ins Co	61	0.33%	0.00	A++

Source of Data: Insurers annual statements and Best's ratings for year given. See the notes in Appendix I for the meanings of symbols.

**Exhibit A**

**Premiums, Market Shares, Loss Ratios and  
Best's Ratings of the Liquor Liability Insurance Market  
1998**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Carrier Name</u>	<u>Written Premiums (\$1,000s)</u>	<u>Market Shares (%)</u>	<u>Loss Ratio (%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1998	1.	North Pointe Insurance Co	10,769	49.04	17.76	B++
	2.	Reliance Insurance Co	4,450	20.27	0.00	A-
	3.	# MLBA Limited Liability Pool	1,411	6.42	25.36	NR-2
	4.	Legion Insurance Co	1,291	5.88	19.87	A
	5.	<sup>s</sup> Columbia Casualty Co	859	3.91	(9.46)	A
	6.	<sup>s</sup> Mount Vernon Fire Ins Co	718	3.27	50.00	A++
	7.	Star Insurance Company	595	2.71	40.06	A-
	8.	# Bowling Proprietors Of Mi Ltd	313	1.42	30.22	B+
	9.	Argonaut Great Central Ins Co	175	0.80	4.04	A-
	10.	United States Fire Ins Co	158	0.72	0.00	A-
	11.	Northwestern National Cas Co	138	0.63	(142.22)	B++
	12.	<sup>s</sup> Illinois EMASCO Ins Co	110	0.50	0.00	A
	13.	TIG Insurance Com0pany	102	0.47	(275.35)	A
	14.	Home-Owners Ins Co	87	0.39	1.00	A++
	15.	Federated Mutual Ins Co	75	0.34	(575.55)	A+
	16.	Calvert Insurance Co	74	0.34	137.22	A-
	17.	Transcontinental Ins Co	68	0.31	9.80	A
	18.	Agricultural Insurance Co	47	0.21	0.00	A
	19.	<sup>s</sup> St Paul Surplus Lines Ins Co	39	0.18	(228.23)	A+
	20.	General Star Indemnity Co	33	0.15	0.00	A++

Source of Data: Insurers annual statements and Best's ratings for year given. See the notes in Appendix I for the meanings of symbols.



**Exhibit A**

**Premiums, Market Shares, Loss Ratios and  
Best's Ratings of the Liquor Liability Insurance Market  
1999**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Carrier Name</u>	<u>Written Premiums (\$1,000s)</u>	<u>Market Shares (%)</u>	<u>Loss Ratio (%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1999	1.	North Pointe Insurance Co	9,787	58.09	16.53	B
	2.	# MLBA Limited Liability Pool	1,385	8.22	5.44	A-
	3.	Legion Insurance Co	1,135	6.74	130.13	NR-2
	4.	<sup>s</sup> Columbia Casualty Co	783	4.65	91.49	A
	5.	Star Insurance Co	699	4.15	137.38	A
	6.	United States Liab. Insur. Co	644	3.82	60.90	A++
	7.	<sup>s</sup> Mt. Vernon Fire Insurance Co	271	1.61	55.00	A-
	8.	# Bowling Proprietors Of Mi Ltd	252	1.49	1.77	B+
	9.	Royal Indemnity Co	183	1.09	0.00	A-
	10.	Argonaut Great Central Ins Co	171	1.01	(1.52)	A-
	11.	TIG Insurance Co	170	1.01	0.00	A-
	12.	<sup>s</sup> Illinois EMASCO Ins Co	129	0.76	0.00	A
	13.	Northwestern Nat'l Cas. Co	126	0.74	(9.76)	B++
	14.	Badger Mutual Insurance Co	105	0.62	0.00	A-
	15.	Federated Mutual Ins Co	85	0.50	49.07	A+
	16.	St. Paul Guardian Insurance Co	63	0.37	361.01	A+
	17.	Reliance National Indemnity Co	63	0.37	0.00	E
	18.	Home-Owners Insurance Co	62	0.37	1.69	A++
	19.	Maryland Casualty Co	58	0.35	0.00	A+
	20.	Ohio Casualty Insurance Co	56	0.33	31.12	A

Source of Data: Insurers annual statements and Best's ratings for year given. See the notes in Appendix I for the meanings of symbols.

These changes have caused a significant increase in concentration in the market as measured by premium written market share. Importantly, since 1986, the increase in concentration resulted in a significant movement from unauthorized ineligible carriers to licensed carriers. However, the changes have produced a significant shift of market share toward less than A-rated insurers.

The data in Exhibit A and in the initial columns of Exhibit B exclude many licensees having package commercial multi-peril policies or commercial general liability policies containing a liquor liability endorsement. Premiums for such endorsements are reflected in the insurers' annual statements with commercial multi-peril premiums on line 5 or with "other" liability on line 17, which include stand-alone liquor liability policy premiums. Other evidence presented indicates that many liquor licensees are likely purchasing insurance in the form of endorsements to commercial package policies from admitted insurers. As such, the concentration of the market, as well as the market share of surplus lines insurers (discussed below), may be lower than the statistics from the Division's written premium reports indicate.

The Liquor Control Commission maintains a database of insurance companies that provide policies to liquor licensees. The right portions of Exhibit B and the C exhibits present data according to the number of licensees that are covered by the insurer since 1988. These data cover a more recent period and are comparable with the A exhibits and the left portion of Exhibit B. Exhibit C, showing the top 20 companies, and Exhibit D show there are many additional major participants in the market. Most of the additional insurers do not appear on the written premium reports because they do not write stand-alone liquor liability policies and report these data with commercial multi-peril or other liability. Insurers, which are not licensed in Michigan and not eligible surplus lines insurers in this state, are not included.

Market shares of licensees from Exhibits B, C, and D indicate a moderately concentrated market. This is partially explained by the inclusion of insurers not typically included in the written premium reports because not all insurers submit annual statements and many report premium data on other commercial lines. There might not be a one-to-one correspondence between the number of licensees and the amount of premium written, which could explain the lower concentration among licensees shown in Exhibit B. Concentration would be higher if insurers with more licensees on average had larger premiums. An example of this difference is North Pointe Insurance Company which, in 1997, had 53% of the premium and 39% of the licensees.

Although higher concentration is generally associated with less competition, neither economic theory nor experience establishes a critical level of concentration at which competition is inhibited or exhibits a tendency toward excessive market power in any industry.

**Exhibit B**

**History of Total Premiums, Loss Ratios, Concentration Measures By Premium,  
Percent of Top 20 A Rated, Percent Surplus Lines and Concentration Measures by Licensees  
Liquor Liability Insurance Market  
1980 - 2000**

Year	Concentration and Other Market Measures Based on Premiums								Concentration Measures Based on Licensees			
	Total Premium	Loss Ratio	Market Shares			% Premium A Rated	Number Carriers	Percent S/L	Market Shares			Number Carriers
			Top 4	Top 8	Top 20				Top 4	Top 8	Top 20	
1980	10,628	153.4%	78.3%	97.6%	99.9%	21.5%	42	N.A.				
1981	10,868	155.5%	67.0%	95.3%	99.9%	47.7%	47	N.A.				
1982	5,246	281.4%	61.1%	90.4%	100.1%	70.5%	35	28.6%				
1983	2,577	143.5%	83.9%	98.1%	102.1%	35.6%	30	N.A.				
1984	4,996	326.0%	72.2%	97.2%	100.0%	74.3%	32	47.9%				
1985	26,831	97.4%	92.1%	99.4%	100.0%	60.7%	22	60.3%				
1986	26,044	61.9%	98.2%	100.1%	100.3%	98.5%	25	98.4%				
1987	23,267	40.0%	91.5%	97.5%	100.0%	81.6%	29	80.2%				
1988	31,047	37.5%	73.7%	96.8%	99.9%	44.0%	29	41.9%	71.1%	83.0%	93.6%	92
1989	25,026	24.6%	62.4%	91.5%	98.2%	34.2%	40	31.1%	70.0%	81.9%	93.7%	93
1990	25,409	37.2%	78.1%	92.9%	99.5%	26.2%	43	24.0%	60.0%	77.9%	91.7%	101
1991	22,065	40.6%	78.4%	96.2%	99.5%	25.5%	39	21.7%	61.4%	75.9%	89.6%	102
1992	22,665	57.1%	74.6%	89.8%	99.2%	31.2%	47	21.8%	65.8%	77.8%	90.5%	105
1993	20,871	97.4%	74.1%	89.6%	99.0%	32.5%	44	20.9%	59.1%	74.6%	89.6%	109
1994	20,871	27.8%	74.3%	87.3%	98.1%	28.1%	52	16.6%	55.8%	72.9%	88.7%	115
1995	19,498	-53.8%	72.8%	87.0%	98.1%	27.7%	53	14.2%	56.3%	71.5%	86.8%	125
1996	19,700	17.7%	70.7%	85.8%	97.9%	29.6%	56	11.6%	54.4%	68.9%	84.3%	141
1997	18,297	45.8%	73.5%	88.4%	98.2%	32.8%	65	9.9%	54.8%	69.6%	84.4%	159
1998	21,960	14.0%	81.6%	92.9%	97.9%	40.1%	66	8.4%	57.0%	70.6%	84.1%	153
1999	16,825	57.2%	77.7%	88.7%	96.3%	24.1%	69	7.3%	55.1%	68.7%	81.4%	170
2000									51.8%	65.6%	78.8%	174
2001									52.8%	65.5%	79.0%	225

Source of Data: Insurers' annual reports, surplus lines premium tax reports, and the Liquor Control Commission Licenses Report (not available until 1988).

Note: The market share of the top carriers might exceed 100 percent due to negative written premium reported by insurers transferring their business.

### **Market Turnover and Participants**

Competition requires relatively low barriers to entry into the market. Entry into the Michigan liquor liability insurance market would seem to be relatively easy. Studies suggest that entry barriers into the property-liability insurance industry generally are not high. The existence of loss cost sharing through rating bureaus may reduce the cost of information to insurers which lessens concerns about entry barriers. The impact of rating bureaus and barriers to competition are discussed at greater length in the Division of Insurance's report entitled, "State of Competition in the Commercial Liability Insurance Market."

We can obtain some indication about entry barriers and competition from the actual rate of turnover of insurers. It is reasonable to expect significant turnover in the liquor liability insurance market if there is workable competition. An examination of the A appendices shows an extremely high rate of turnover in the top 20 firms over the period 1980 through 1999. Remarkably, major participants quickly appear and disappear within the span of three or four years. Exhibit D examines the number of licensees each year since 1988 for the current top 20 insurers. In Appendix D, all current carriers are ranked by the number of licensees over the period covered. Exhibit D and Appendix D show a high turnover rate.

Since the mandatory insurance requirement for liquor retailers was enacted in 1988, admitted or licensed insurers have written the highest number of policies for Michigan liquor licensees. Using Liquor Control Commission records, Appendix D indicates that, as of March 2001, 95.3% of the policies received were from admitted insurers and 4.7% were from eligible surplus lines insurers. In the period 1990 to 2001, the percentage of non-admitted ineligible carriers fell from 13.3% to under 0.1%. This decline is largely due to the number of licensees who have moved from purchasing groups sponsored by the Bel-Aire Insurance Company. Missouri, its state of domicile, placed Bel-Aire in receivership in 1991. Before Bel-Aire was placed in receivership, its licensees were forced to find coverage elsewhere. This was due to the passage of Public Act 214 of 1989, which required purchasing groups to purchase insurance for their Michigan risks from authorized insurers, eligible unauthorized insurers (approved surplus lines carriers), or from risk-retention groups. This denied access to ineligible carriers.

## Exhibit C

### REPORT ON LICENSEES

**Report Date: 1/96**

	<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Licensees</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1.	North Pointe Insurance Company	5,560	33.2%	B
2.	United States Liability Insurance Company	1,261	7.5%	A++
3.	Legion Insurance Company	1,253	7.5%	A-
4.	Mich. Licensed Bev. Assoc. Limited Liability Pool	784	4.7%	NR2
5.	National Union Fire Insurance Co. of Pittsburgh, PA	721	4.3%	A++
6.	Citizens Insurance Company of America	506	3.0%	A
7.	s Columbia Casualty Company	490	2.9%	A
8.	Star Insurance Company	401	2.4%	B++
9.	United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company	358	2.1%	A+
10.	Commercial Union Insurance Company	237	1.4%	A+
11.	Employers Mutual Casualty Company	230	1.4%	A
12.	Argonaut Great Central Insurance Company	210	1.3%	A-
13.	Northwestern National Casualty Company	206	1.2%	B++
14.	National Surety Corporation	174	1.0%	A++
15.	Badger Mutual Insurance Company	171	1.0%	A-
16.	Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company	150	0.9%	A+
17.	American Country Insurance Company	130	0.8%	A-
18.	Continental Casualty Company	128	0.8%	A
19.	American Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Company	127	0.8%	A
20.	American Motorists Insurance Company	127	0.8%	A
<b>Totals: (last value is percent at A - or better)</b>		<b>14,556</b>	<b>84.3%</b>	<b>31.4%</b>

**Report Date: 1/97**

	<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Licensees</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1.	North Pointe Insurance Company	6,639	38.8%	B+
2.	# MI Licnsd Beverage Assn Ltd LiabPool	985	5.8%	NR1
3.	Legion Insurance Company	953	5.6%	A
4.	First Security Casualty Company	809	4.7%	(3)
5.	s Columbia Casualty Company	737	4.3%	A
6.	National Union Fire Ins Co of PtsbgPA	692	4.0%	A++
7.	s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	613	3.6%	A++
8.	Star Insurance Company	496	2.9%	A-
9.	Citizens Insurance Co of America	406	2.4%	A+
10.	Old Republic Insurance Company	288	1.7%	B+
11.	Northwestern National Casualty Co	271	1.6%	B+
12.	Commercial Union Insurance Co	221	1.3%	A
13.	Federal Insurance Company	195	1.1%	A++
14.	American Motorists Insurance Co	179	1.0%	A
15.	Calvert Insurance Company	171	1.0%	A
16.	National Surety Corporation	171	1.0%	A
17.	Aetna Casualty & Surety Company	168	1.0%	A-
18.	United States Fire Insurance Co	159	0.9%	A
19.	Federated Mutual Insurance Co	155	0.9%	A
20.	s Illinois EMASCO Insurance Co	153	0.9%	A
<b>Totals: (last value is percent at A - or better)</b>		<b>14,461</b>	<b>84.4%</b>	<b>31.9%</b>

Source of Data: Liquor Control Commission (footnotes in Appendix I)

## Exhibit C - Continued

**Report Date: 1/98**

<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Licensees</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1. North Pointe Insurance Company	7,012	41.1%	B++
2. Legion Insurance Company	1,063	6.2%	A
3.# MI Licnsd Beverage Assn Ltd LP	943	5.5%	NR1
4.s Columbia Casualty Company	716	4.2%	A
5. Nat'l Union Fire Ins Co of Ptsbg PA	671	3.9%	A++
6. Star Insurance Company	586	3.4%	A-
7.s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	579	3.4%	A++
8. Citizens Insurance Company of Am	496	2.9%	A+
9. Reliance Insurance Company	312	1.8%	A-
10. Northwestern National Casualty Co	245	1.4%	B+
11. Commercial Union Insurance Co	229	1.3%	A
12. Federal Insurance Company	219	1.3%	A++
13.s Illinois EMASCO Insurance Co	184	1.1%	A
14. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co	183	1.1%	A
15. National Surety Corporation	172	1.0%	A
16. Safeco Insurance Co of America	172	1.0%	A++
17. Calvert Insurance Company	157	0.9%	A
18. United States Fire Insurance Co	155	0.9%	A
19. Continental Casualty Company	137	0.8%	A
20. Bowling Proprietors of MI Ltd LP	135	0.8%	B+
<b>Totals: (last value is percent at A- or better)</b>	<b>14,366</b>	<b>84.1%</b>	<b>35.3%</b>

**Report Date: 1/99**

<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Licensees</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1. North Pointe Insurance Company	6,506	38.2%	B++
2. Legion Insurance Company	1,158	6.8%	A
3. # MI Licnsd Beverage Assn Ltd LP	901	5.3%	NR1
4. Nat'l Union Fire Ins Co of Ptsbg PA	825	4.8%	A++
5. s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	689	4.0%	A++
6. s Columbia Casualty Company	631	3.7%	A
7. Citizens Insurance Company of Am	539	3.2%	A
8. Star Insurance Company	448	2.6%	A-
9. Reliance Insurance Company	335	2.0%	A-
10. Commercial Union Insurance Co	226	1.3%	A
11. s Illinois EMASCO Insurance Co	222	1.3%	A
12. Northwestern National Casualty Co	218	1.3%	B++
13. National Surety Corporation	178	1.0%	A
14. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co	158	0.9%	A
15. United States Fire Insurance Co	156	0.9%	A-
16. Safeco Insurance Co of America	149	0.9%	A+
17. Continental Casualty Company	145	0.9%	A
18. Firemans Fund Insurance Company	143	0.8%	A
19. s Lexington Insurance Company	126	0.7%	A++
20. Argonaut Great Central Insurance Co	119	0.7%	A-
<b>Totals: (last value is percent at A- or better)</b>	<b>13,872</b>	<b>81.4%</b>	<b>36.7%</b>

Source of Data: Liquor Control Commission (footnotes in Appendix I)

### Exhibit C - Continued

**Report Date: 1/00**

	<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Licensees</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1.	North Pointe Insurance Company	5,944	35.17%	B++
2.	Legion Insurance Company	1,130	6.69%	A
3.	# MI Licnsd Beverage Assn Ltd LP	857	5.07%	NR2
4.	United States Liability Insurance Co	828	4.90%	A++
5.	Nat'l Union Fire Ins Co of Ptsbg PA	817	4.83%	A++
6.	Citizens Insurance Company of Am	558	3.30%	A
7.	<sup>s</sup> Columbia Casualty Company	520	3.08%	A
8.	Star Insurance Company	437	2.59%	A-
9.	Reliance Insurance Company	323	1.91%	A-
10.	Commercial Union Insurance Co	263	1.56%	A+
11.	<sup>s</sup> Illinois EMASCO Insurance Co	257	1.52%	A
12.	Northwestern National Casualty Co	196	1.16%	B++
13.	Argonaut Great Central Ins Co	178	1.05%	A-
14.	National Surety Corporation	176	1.04%	A+
15.	Firemans Fund Insurance Company	159	0.94%	A+
16.	United States Fidelity & Grnty Co	158	0.93%	A
17.	Continental Casualty Company	136	0.80%	A
18.	American States Insurance Co.	133	0.79%	A+
19.	<sup>s</sup> Lexington Insurance Company	132	0.78%	A++
20.	Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Co	124	0.73%	A+
<b>Totals:</b> (last value is percent at A - or better)		<b>13,326</b>	<b>78.8%</b>	<b>37.4%</b>

Source of Data: Liquor Control Commission (footnotes in Appendix I)

**Report Date: 1/01**

	<u>Company Name</u>	<u>Licensees</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1.	North Pointe Insurance Company	5,560	33.2%	B
2.	United States Liability Insurance Company	1,261	7.5%	A++
3.	Legion Insurance Company	1,253	7.5%	A-
4.	Mich. Lic'd Assoc. Ltd. Liability Pool	784	4.7%	NR2
5.	Nat'l Union Fire Ins Co of Ptsbg PA	721	4.3%	A++
6.	Citizens Insurance Co of America	506	3.0%	A
7.	Columbia Casualty Company	490	2.9%	A
8.	Star Insurance Company	401	2.4%	B++
9.	United States Fidltly. and Guar. Company	358	2.1%	A+
10.	Commercial Union Insurance Company	237	1.4%	A+
11.	Employers Mutual Casualty Company	230	1.4%	A
12.	Argonaut Great Central Insurance Company	210	1.3%	A-
13.	Northwestern National Casualty Company	206	1.2%	B++
14.	National Surety Corporation	174	1.0%	A++
15.	Badger Mutual Insurance Company	171	1.0%	A-
16.	Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company	150	0.9%	A+
17.	American Country Insurance Company	130	0.8%	A-
18.	Continental Casualty Company	128	0.8%	A
19.	<sup>s</sup> American Mnfrctrs. Mutual Insurance Company	127	0.8%	A
20.	American Motorists Insurance Company	127	0.8%	A
<b>Totals:</b> (last value is percent at A - or better)		<b>13,224</b>	<b>79.0%</b>	<b>37.5%</b>

Source of Data: Liquor Control Commission (footnotes in Appendix I)

Liquor licensees can choose from numerous insurance carriers. Based on liquor liability premium, the number of carriers indicated in Exhibit B fell from the high of the decade of 47 in 1981 to the low of 22 in 1985 but has since risen to 69 in 1999. Again, the number of carriers does not include those licensees buying a liquor liability endorsement on their commercial package policies.

Appendix D, based on licensees, presents a much-improved picture with 92 carriers in 1988, rising to 225 in 2001, 203 of which are admitted carriers. As previously mentioned, this exhibit includes purchasing group carriers and carriers selling liquor liability endorsements to their commercial multi-peril and commercial general liability policies. Exhibit D also shows the current willingness of admitted insurers to expand their market shares. For six admitted insurers -- Legion Insurance Company, United States Liability Insurance Company, United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Badger Mutual Insurance Company, American Country Insurance Company, and American Home Assurance Company, the number licensees they insured increased by over 50 in the last year.



## Exhibit D

### The Current Top 20 Michigan Liquor Licensee Insurance Providers Since 1988

		Date of Report:															
Company Name		9/88	2/89	1/90	1/91	1/92	1/93	1/94	1/95	1/96	1/97	1/98	1/99	1/00	1/01		
1.	North Pointe Insurance Company	4,893	4,856	3,637	4,447	5,439	5,856	6,034	6,531	6,520	6,639	7,012	6,506	5,944	5,560	-	
2.	United States Liability Insurance Co													828	1,261	++	
3.	Legion Insurance Company									106	953	1,063	1,158	1,130	1,253	++	
4.	# Mich. Lic'd Assoc Ltd Liability Pool	3,105	3,083	2,806	2,637	2,091	1,682	1,364	1,194	1,074	985	943	901	857	784	-	
5.	Nat'l Union Fire Ins Co of Ptsbg PA	456	453	438	322	395	427	414	423	668	692	671	825	817	721	-	
6.	Citizens Insurance Company of Am	225	235	353	477	585	552	471	458	424	406	496	539	558	506	-	
7.	Columbia Casualty Company	1,007	953	770	683	799	943	1,001	879	791	737	716	631	520	490	-	
8.	Star Insurance Company							6	8	370	496	586	448	437	401	-	
9.	United States Fidlty and Guar Co	110	135	125	98	90	77	67	69	70	75	183	158	158	358	++	
10.	Commercial Union Insurance Co	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	146	193	221	229	226	263	237	-	
11.	Employers Mutual Casualty Co														230	++	
12.	Argonaut Great Central Insurance Co	87	81	78	68	82	63	40	20	31	31	62	119	178	210	+	
13.	Northwestern National Casualty Co	100	105	117	134	225	286	296	307	317	271	245	218	196	206		
14.	National Surety Corporation						5	169	167	168	171	172	178	176	174		
15.	Badger Mutual Insurance Company												6	77	171	++	
16.	Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Co										10	28	91	124	150	+	
17.	American Country Insurance Co												4	59	130	++	
18.	Continental Casualty Company	73	73	71	104	102	104	101	83	87	99	137	145	136	128	++	
19.	American Mnfctrs Mut Ins Company			7	8	7	5	6	4	24	24	2	2	117	127	++	
20.	American Motorists Insurance Co	124	131	134	136	175	177	170	183	182	179	113	114	121	127	++	

Source of Data: Liquor Control Commission Report on Licensees. Codes: # signifies a limited liability pool; s signifies an eligible surplus lines insurer; + or - signifies an increase or decrease of 20 to 99 licensees; ++ or -- signifies an increase or decrease of 100 or more licensees.

### **Other Factors Affecting Availability**

The liquor liability insurance market during the 1980s was extremely volatile due to the changes in dramshop liability litigation and the adverse impact of the underwriting cycle. The impact of these changes is reflected in the huge increases in market-wide loss ratios presented in Exhibit B. High loss ratios in 1984 indicated rates were inadequate, causing many admitted insurers to leave the market. This, in turn, created a significant availability problem.

This was a rational response by insurers. Insurers, like most business owners, are "risk averse." Insurers minimize risks by relying on claims experience and the law of large numbers to achieve greater statistical certainty of outcomes of their underwriting efforts. Significant changes in the legal principles of determining and assigning liability and volatility of jury awards and judgments mean that past experience may not reliably predict losses. When past experience fails as a predictor, insurers may refuse to underwrite the line of insurance.

Liquor liabilities were perceived to be more variable and carry greater risk, leading to higher premiums. The effect on the market of the changes in the expected cost of liabilities and the swings in expected investment returns and expected inflation was magnified. During the profitable/expansion phase of the cycle, many traditional insurers seemed willing to underwrite this type of business. As the cycle turns to the less profitable/contraction phase, such risks encounter problems obtaining coverage. Many are uninsured or insured by surplus lines insurers.

In 1984, the market-wide loss ratio hit 326%, meaning losses exceeded three times the premiums earned. That year marked the beginning of the hard market and the steep rise in premium rates. After 1984, market-wide loss ratios declined, falling to as low as 25% in 1989. Loss ratios fell for a couple of years despite declining rates beginning around 1988. Loss ratios began to recover eventually peaking at 97% in 1993. Loss ratios have been volatile in recent years. The loss ratio for one major carrier in 1993 might have been too high, causing it to correct on the low side in 1995 and 1996. The industry loss ratios have remained low at 46%, 14%, and 57% in 1997, 1998, and 1999, respectively. Further discussion of this appears in the Reasonableness of Rates Section.

Profitable insurance lines are typified by low loss ratios, which encourages market entry. The stronger competition has led to relaxed underwriting rules, reduced premium rates, and greater availability, especially from admitted insurers. Greater competition has caused premiums to trend lower (see next section) and more insurers have provided coverage. However, given the volatility of industry loss ratios, it is uncertain whether rates have fallen to competitive levels where loss ratios might range from 60-80%.

Prior to enactment of the insurance requirement, it was expected that bars and taverns would have difficulty obtaining sources of coverage. North Pointe Insurance Company and the Michigan Licensed Beverage Association Limited Liability Pool targeted this segment of the market and eased the concern about availability. Several insurers originally excluded the bars and taverns from their underwriting plans but later became interested in writing such coverages.

Private clubs also were considered to be a high-risk classification. Some national organizations, such as the Elks, could obtain group coverage through their national charter. Others were able to get liquor liability endorsed onto their general liability policies. With over 100 liquor liability insurers writing coverage for licensees (as shown in Exhibit D), and several companies targeting the higher-risk classes, liquor retailers should continue to have many insurer options.

Exhibit B displays surplus lines liability insurance premiums as a percentage of written premiums for 1982 and 1984 through 1999. The percentage of surplus lines is developed from the Division's surplus lines premium tax reports which show all surplus lines volume reported for tax purposes. The percentage of the market covered by surplus lines insurers is a measure of the availability of liquor liability insurance over the period since 1982.

Historically, surplus lines insurers had an advantage over admitted insurers in the liquor liability line. Surplus lines insurers have not had to obtain approval for their insurance forms or rates from state insurance regulators. The Liquor Control Commission requires that any policy purchased to satisfy financial responsibility requirements must meet the specific requirements in Section 22f of the Liquor Control Act of 1936, MCL 436.22f, regardless of whether it is a surplus lines policy. The lifting of the policy forms filing requirement and changes in taxation rates affecting admitted carriers have reduced this advantage, particularly for domestic companies. Even though surplus lines carriers are more able to quickly change policy language, alter rates, and enter and exit the state, they have lost significant market share to local admitted carriers.

Given the relative ease of entry into and exit from markets and specific lines of insurance, surplus lines insurers can be viewed as a safety valve. This is particularly true for companies having abnormal risks and difficulty finding an admitted insurer or because admitted insurers have stopped underwriting certain lines of insurance during the hard phase of the underwriting cycle. Surplus lines insurers are a free market response for handling risks that otherwise might require formation of a residual market -- a common regulatory response to such difficulties.

With this in mind, the percentages of the market covered by surplus lines insurers might be used as a measure of insurance availability. Surplus lines liquor liability insurance premiums grew from 29% of the total market in 1982 and peaked at 98% in 1986. This growth probably reflected problems in the liquor liability line and the hardening of insurance markets in that period. Since 1986, surplus lines as a percentage of the total market fell dramatically to 4.7% in 1999. The decline in surplus lines premium from 1986 to 1999 reflects the perceived impact of tort reforms and the general softening of insurance markets.

Exhibit D and Appendix D indicate that a few surplus lines insurers have been able to reverse the decline in their insureds. United National Insurance Company and Scottsdale Insurance Company increased their insureds from 2000 while Mt. Hawley Insurance Company remained at 2000 level. In 2001, insurance availability remains very good with surplus lines market share, as measured by numbers of licensees, continuing to fall to under 5% in 2001.

### **Insurance Carrier Quality**

The newness, small size, and turnover of insurers in liquor liability insurance causes concern over the claims-paying capacity of many insurers in this line. The oldest and most widely quoted insurance rating firm is A. M. Best Company of Oldwick, New Jersey. Best provides ratings based on insurers' annual financial reports and survey information for several years of operations. Best annually rates over 2,300 property and casualty insurers. The meanings of Best's ratings are presented in Appendix I. Best attaches no warranty or guaranty to their ratings.

As Exhibits A, B, and C show, the percentage of the liquor liability insurance market written by A-rated carriers fluctuates yearly. In recent years, licensees have gravitated to three newly established (two are non-rated) insurers domiciled in Michigan. Exhibit B indicates a decline in the percentage of premium written by liquor liability insurers in the top 20 which are A-rated from 98% in 1986 to a low of 26% in 1991. Since 1995, the percentage trended higher, reaching 40% in 1998. The percentage fell to 30.0% in 1999. The percentages of licensees with A-rated companies in Exhibit C for the same years parallel these observations.

The current 30.0% of liquor liability insurance premiums written by A-rated carriers contrasts unfavorably with the total property and casualty insurance market in Michigan where, typically, 90% of the premiums are written by A-rated insurers. This shift from A-rated insurers has occurred since the enactment of the financial responsibility requirements.

The main reason for this is that many licensees seek to maintain their licenses with the least-cost coverage. Many formerly uninsured licensees with few, if any, assets at risk were completing only the paperwork necessary to maintain their licenses. Other licensees adversely affected by the underwriting cycle and high premium rates were looking for the lowest cost coverage. These circumstances led many licensees to focus strictly on fulfilling the statutory requirements of licensure even, in some cases, at the expense of achieving financial security.

The incidence of insolvency tends to be higher among low-rated and non-rated insurers. Low- and non-rated insurers typically have insufficient operating experience, small capacity, rapid growth, high leverage, unfavorable liquidity, reserve deficiencies, excessive operating losses, and no affiliation with established and rated insurers. For these reasons, the Liquor Control Commission has worked cooperatively with the Division of Insurance in monitoring new market entrants.

### **III**

#### **REASONABLENESS OF RATES**

When the major insurance carriers were first surveyed for the 1988 liquor liability report, the market was beginning to soften after a particularly hard phase of the underwriting cycle. Compounding the unsettled condition of the market at that time were the uncertainties of the effects of the mandatory insurance requirements and limitations on liability discussed in the introduction to this report. When liquor liability insurance companies were first surveyed in 1987, their rates were quite diverse.

### **Loss Ratios and Insurer Profitability**

Differing assumptions among insurers as to how the dramshop law revisions would affect company loss experience appears to be responsible for variations in rates. After passage of the revisions to the dramshop act, loss ratios were lower than expected. Some companies expected 1987 loss ratios to be in the 60 to 80% range. Loss ratios averaged 40% or less in 1987 and each subsequent year until 1992 when the ratio reached 57%. For this reason, many companies reassessed the effect the dramshop law changes on future losses. In an effort to obtain premiums that track closely to loss data, insurers have been adjusting rates downward between 1987 and 2001, as shown in Exhibit E.

Loss ratios are the ratio of estimated losses in a given year, divided by premiums earned in the same year. Losses incurred for a given year include losses from claims made and paid that year, losses expected in future years based on claims reported and unreported that year and changes in anticipated future payments on unpaid claims from prior years.

To some extent loss ratios can indicate insurer profitability because insurer profits largely are defined as the difference between revenues or premiums earned, and costs or losses incurred. Although investment income revenues and underwriting and other overhead costs are not included, loss ratios can reflect profit levels if reviewed over a period of time.

It would appear that this line has become very profitable for insurers in recent years, as market-wide loss ratios have fallen considerably since 1984. These ratios fell even further from the 40% ratio in 1987, to 37% in 1988, and 25% in 1989. From 1990 to 1993, the industry-wide ratio climbed to an apparently unprofitable level. However, the volatility of one major carrier's loss ratios has greatly affected the industry averages.

The volatility of losses incurred in this market is epitomized by Columbia Casualty Company (as shown in Appendix A4), which, in 1993, 1994, and 1995, had loss ratios of 696%, -71% and -1,121%, respectively. The loss figures of this company, one that is highly rated by Best's, disproportionately affected the industry loss ratios (Exhibit B), which were 97%, 28%, and -54%, respectively. Presumably, the company misjudged incurred losses in 1993 that were corrected over the next couple of years. Were the company's incurred losses spread evenly for the last three years, their loss ratios would have been -82%, -90%, and -104% and the revised industry loss ratios would have been 21%, 26%, and 18%. The reasons for these fluctuations are unclear. The industry loss ratios in 1996, 1997, and 1998 continued low at 18%, 46%, and 14%, respectively. Low loss ratios over an extended period indicate a highly profitable insurance line.

One might argue that such low market-wide loss ratios indicate excessively high premium rates. However, the loss ratios could be low because actual settlement costs for claims since 1987 have been lower than expected. Or, insurers may not have correctly anticipated the reduced liabilities provided by the dramshop law amendments. Ratios could also be low because of inadequate reserving. Inadequate reserving could

occur if insurers do not adequately anticipate future losses and thereby, under-report incurred losses. Should future losses from prior years exceed expectations, current year incurred losses could grow considerably due to the addition of prior policy year loss changes. The possibility of under-reported loss expectations makes reliance on loss ratios for analysis or regulatory policy decisions a risky. The historically volatile loss ratios evident in this line of insurance illustrate this risk.

Some insurance industry officials, believing that premium rates had been unsustainably low, thought that loss ratios would grow rapidly after 1989. However, the industry loss ratio was high only in 1993 possibly due to one insurer's miscalculation of losses incurred. Thus, there appears to be no reason for the Division to be concerned over the adequacy of rates relative to losses. The Division still must monitor insurers who are greatly expanding their sales of liquor liability insurance to ensure the adequacy of reserves and surplus to meet future obligations.

### **Rate Levels**

Apart from whether liquor liability insurance should be a required coverage, high cost was the biggest complaint at the time the dramshop amendments were enacted. One statutory requirement is that this report must consider an overall premium rate level which is not excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory, rating terms which are defined in Section 2403(1)(d) of the Insurance Code of 1956, MCL 500.2403(1)(d), see Appendix II.

In response to the law changes, insurers appear to be competing for business by reducing rates and expanding availability to all types of licensees. The Division of Insurance has observed that base rates have been trending downward since 1988. Exhibit E presents survey data of market average base and minimum premium rates for some of the top carriers. The survey results indicate significant reductions in both average minimum premiums and average premium rates since 1987.

### **Minimum Premiums**

When the mandatory dramshop insurance law took effect, the former Insurance Bureau received a number of complaints from small licensees claiming they could not afford liquor liability insurance. This was, in part, due to the high minimum premiums established by companies as part of their underwriting plan. A minimum premium is the lowest premium for which a company will issue a policy, despite the amount that is actually generated when rates are applied to liquor receipts. If, for example, an insurance company established for take-out liquor stores a \$.80 rate per \$100 of liquor sold, and a minimum premium of \$500, a store would have to sell \$62,500 of liquor annually to generate the minimum premium. As a store's liquor receipts decline, the effective rate it pays for insurance increases. The effective rate for a store selling only \$10,000 of liquor annually and paying a \$500 premium is \$5.00 per \$100 of liquor sold.

Among the companies surveyed in 1987, average minimum premiums were \$700 for the lowest-risk class and as high as \$3,000 for bars, taverns, and clubs. In 1988, the staff of the former Insurance Bureau believed that these high minimum premiums imposed an effective rate that was unfairly discriminatory to small businesses and requested that they be reduced. Most companies complied with this request by

reducing minimum premiums. The former Insurance Bureau took administrative action against those that did not. Subsequent negotiations with the remaining insurers resulted in a resolution of this issue. The survey indicates that currently lowest minimum premiums for bars and taverns range from \$625 to about \$750 for admitted carriers. An examination of Exhibit E indicates that current average minimum premium is over 74% lower than in 1987.

### **Market Conduct**

A popular company rating strategy is to revise the class structure. Where risk classifications for rating purposes were previously based on six to seven classes of retail liquor licenses, commonly insurers now further segment these classes based on various characteristics of the individual businesses. Many companies, for example, now divide the restaurant and bar/tavern classifications into subgroups according to the ratio of food to liquor served, or the type and amount of entertainment offered. This practice enables an insurer to attract with lower rates "low risk" business within a licensee class while maintaining an acceptable loss ratio by having higher rates for the higher-risk licensees.

The diversity of company rate classifications complicates comparisons of specific rates by insurers. While one company may offer a single rate for bars and taverns, it is not unusual for another to offer as many as eight classes based on the amount and type of entertainment. Carriers typically have different classes within license types which vary by percentage of revenues from liquor sales. Territorial rates exist within classes, with rural rates tending to be slightly lower than rates in southeast Michigan.

## Exhibit E

### Rate Survey of Top Seven Liquor Liability Carriers 1987 and 2001

Average Minimum Premiums and Base Rates per \$100 Sales:  
(Assumes the purchase of the minimum limits \$50,000 policy)

Risk Classifications: Assumption on Sales	<u>Average</u> <u>Minimum Premiums</u>			<u>Average</u> <u>Rates Per \$100 Sales</u>			<u>2001 Rates</u>	
	<u>1987</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>% Chg</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>% Chg</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>

#### Restaurants & Hotels:

Liquor 49% of Sales	2,023	475	-76.5	3.06	0.80	-73.9	0.60	0.99
Liquor 19% of Sales	1,494	430	-71.2	2.12	0.68	-67.9	0.36	0.99

#### Clubs, Where:

Liquor 51% of Sales	2,573	688	-73.3	5.26	1.43	-72.8	1.25	1.61
Liquor 29% of Sales	2,045	600	-70.7	3.28	1.11	-66.2	0.60	1.61

#### Bars & Taverns:

Liquor 81% of Sales	2,906	688	-76.3	4.65	1.63	-64.9	1.25	2.00
Liquor 79% of Sales	2,906	688	-76.3	4.65	1.63	-64.9	1.25	2.00

#### Merchants:

Package Stores	826	213	-74.2	0.79	0.22	-72.2	0.15	0.28
Other Retail Stores								

Average Accumulated Rate Changes:                      -74.1%                      -69.0%

Source of Data: Division of Insurance phone survey of certain carriers



Admitted insurers are probably further discounting base rates through the use of schedule rating and server training discounts. While schedule rating criteria vary considerably by company, the total impact on an insured's rate may not exceed a 25% increase or decrease. Schedule rating criteria include employer selection, training and supervision of employees, the existence of entertainment (bands, dance floors, devices, etc.), following risk management techniques (such as designated drivers or cab programs), management experience, percentage of young patrons and conditions of premises and equipment. The dramshop act also requires admitted insurers to have server training rate discounts of up to 15%. The combined effect of these factors can be to discount rates by more than one-third.

Surplus lines insurers typically do not use schedule rating or allow server-training discounts because of the difficulties in monitoring compliance by insureds. In order to compete, most surplus lines carriers have simply reduced rates for all licensee classifications. While some surplus lines carriers have left the market due to the increasing competition from admitted carriers, several continue to have competitive rates and are keeping their clientele.

### **Regulation of Rates**

In the 1988, 1989 and 1990 reports, a rate of \$3 per \$100 of liquor sold was cautiously declared to be an appropriate rate for all classes of liquor retailers combined. It was determined at the time that the \$3 per \$100 rate continued to meet the standards of Section 2403(1)(d) of the Insurance Code of 1956, MCL 500.2403(1)(d). As already noted, the effects of the dramshop revisions on rates have been significant. Competition among insurers has significantly lowered rate levels since 1987. Some carriers are offering base rates of less than \$3 per 100 for the highest risk bar and tavern classifications. From the loss ratio data in the A appendices and exhibits, a \$3 rate might be too high for many classes and too low for others. No single rate level will accommodate all classes. Depending on the type of establishment to be insured, higher or lower rates may also be appropriate since licensee classifications pose varying degrees of risk to insurers. Loss ratio data since 1987 indicates that insurers are making significant profits in this line of insurance. As insurers compete for this profitable business, base rates for insurance premiums as well as minimum premium levels continue to trend lower.

## IV

### CONCLUSIONS

The Commissioner of Insurance finds that:

1. Based on 1999 premium data information, admitted carriers control 92.7% of the liquor liability market. Based on 2001 licensee data, admitted carriers control 95.3% of this market. The market share of surplus line companies appears to have stabilized at less than 10%, which is comparatively low for most commercial lines. Five admitted insurers – Legion Insurance Company, United States Liability Insurance Company, United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Badger Mutual Insurance Company, and American Country Insurance Company –insured more than 50 additional licensees in the last year. However, market share going to new companies less than A-rated or non-rated by Best raises concerns about their ability to withstand serious and prolonged adverse conditions.
2. As of March 2000, the top 20 insurers provided policies to 79% of licensees and the top carrier provided policies for nearly 33.2% of licensees in Michigan according to Liquor Control Commission data. Seven of the top eight companies do not restrict policies to any class or classes of licensees. There are 225 companies providing liquor liability coverage either in the form of a liquor liability policy or coverage endorsed onto a general liability policy.
3. Competition has resulted in average reductions of over 74% in minimum premiums and 69% in premium rates since 1987. Insurers are using several rate-reducing strategies to remain competitive. Rates are being reduced also because 1987 to 1999 loss experience was less than originally anticipated. The impact of dramshop reforms on loss experience in Michigan since 1987 has been significantly better than insurers expected. Low loss ratios over the last six years indicate that this line has been very profitable. Additional competition could drive premium rates even lower.
4. Since 1987, most licensed companies have lowered both minimum premiums and premium rates. This will enable most businesses to obtain policies in 2001 at premium rates much lower than were offered in 1987.
5. For the moment, for all liquor licensee classes combined, \$3 per \$100 of liquor sold continues to meet the statutory standards, i.e., not excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory. However, due to favorable loss experience since passage of the dramshop act revisions and significant differences in classifying risks, the \$3 benchmark rate may be too high for some risks and too low for others.
6. Liquor liability insurance is currently available in Michigan at a reasonable premium.

## APPENDIX I

### Footnotes to Exhibits A, C, and D

- \$ - See below for meanings and discussion of Best's ratings
- a - business purchased by First Security Casualty Company
- d - company dissolved in 1988
- s - eligible surplus lines carriers
- \* - noneligible surplus lines carriers
- # - limited liability pools
- @ - company in receivership or liquidated

### Meanings of Best's Ratings - Exhibits and Appendices A and C

The ratings are Best's evaluation of an insurer's ability to meet the liabilities which may arise under its insurance contracts. In 1995 Best's added "Financial Performance Ratings" (see below) and two levels, "Secure" and "Vulnerable," of letter ratings. See the "Best's Insurance Reports - Property-Casualty" edition for the respective year given in the exhibits for the then current meaning of the ratings. The meanings of the ratings after the 1986 revisions and the percentage of all rated property and casualty carriers nationwide at each rating in 1993 and 1995 are as follows:

#### Letter Ratings:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Meaning</u>	<u>Percent in 1993</u>	<u>Percent in 1995</u>
Secure	A+,A++	Superior	21.1%	18.2%
	A	Excellent	17.8%	17.9%
	A-	Excellent	16.8%	16.8%
	B+,B++	Very Good	8.2%	11.2%
Vulnerable	B	Good	2.0%	2.5%
	B-	Good	0.8%	1.0%
	C+,C++	Fair	0.2%	0.7%
	C	Marginal	0.3%	0.3%
	C-	Marginal	0.1%	0.1%
	D,E,F	Other	3.5%	1.2%
	NA	Not Assigned	29.3%	30.0%

## APPENDIX I - Continued

Best does not assign a rating to certain carriers for various reasons. Prior to 1986 these carriers were given a "NR" or not rated classification. After 1986, greater specificity was given to "Not Assigned" or "NA" classifications. Currently, the first five of these nine classifications are as follows:

### Not Assigned Categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
NA1	Special or Limited Data Filing
NA2	Less Than Minimum Size
NA3	Insufficient Experience
NA4	Rating Procedure Inapplicable
NA5	Significant Change

In 1995, Best began to assign a numerical "Financial Performance Rating" to those insurers classified either NA2 or NA3 that have met their financial reporting requirements. Best arranged these ratings with the appropriate letter ratings and security levels as follows:

### Numerical Financial Performance Rating:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Meaning</u>	<u>Letter Equivalent</u>	<u>Percent in 1995</u>
Secure	(9)	Strong	A+ or A++	0.0%
	(8)	Strong	A	0.1%
	(7)	Above Average	A-	0.5%
	(6)	Above Average	B++	1.2%
Vulnerable	(5)	Average	B+	1.6%
	(4)	Average	B- or B	2.0%
	(3)	Below Average	C+ or C++	0.8%
	(2)	Below Average	C- or C	0.1%

## APPENDIX II

The report on availability of liquor liability insurance is mandated by Section 2409b of the Insurance Code of 1956, MCL 500.2409b, which is reproduced below:

- (1) The commissioner shall issue a report detailing the state of availability in the liquor liability insurance market and delineating specific classifications of liquor liability insurance where reasonable availability does not exist not later than March 1, 1988, and each year thereafter. The report shall be based on relevant economic tests, including but not limited to those in subsection (2). The findings in the report shall not be based on any single measure of reasonable availability, but appropriate weight shall be given to all measures of reasonable availability. The report shall include a certification of whether or not liquor liability insurance is reasonably available in this state including whether it is available at a reasonable premium.
- (2) All of the following shall be considered by the commissioner for purposes of subsection (1):
  - (a) The extent to which any insurer controls the liquor liability insurance market in this state, or any portion thereof.
  - (b) Whether the total number of companies providing liquor liability insurance in this state is sufficient to provide multiple options to liquor licensees.
  - (c) The disparity among liquor liability insurance rates.
  - (d) The overall rate level which is not excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory.
  - (e) Any other factors the commissioner considers relevant.
- (3) The report and certification required under subsection (1) shall be submitted to the liquor control commission, all members of the house of representatives committees on insurance and liquor control, and all the members of the senate committee on commerce.
- (4) For purposes of this section, "liquor liability insurance" means any of the following that provide security for liability under section 22 of Act No. 8 of the Public Acts of the Extra Session of 1933, being section 436.22 of the Michigan Compiled Laws:
  - (a) An insurance policy.
  - (b) A bond.
  - (c) Membership in a limited liability pool under chapter 65.

## **APPENDIX II**

**continued . . .**

Authority for the Commissioner of Insurance to regulate insurance premium rates is found in Section 2403(1)(d) of the Insurance Code of 1956, MCL 500.2403(1)(d), which is reproduced below:

- (1) All rates shall be made in accordance with this section and all of the following:
- (d) Rates shall not be excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory. A rate shall not be held to be excessive unless the rate is unreasonably high for the insurance coverage provided and a reasonable degree of competition does not exist with respect to the classification, kind, or type of risks to which the rate is applicable. A rate shall not be held to be inadequate unless the rate is unreasonably low for the insurance coverage provided and the continued use of the rate endangers the solvency of the insurer; or unless the rate is unreasonably low for the insurance provided and the use of the rate has or will have the effect of destroying competition among insurers, creating a monopoly, or causing a kind of insurance to be unavailable to a significant number of applicants who are in good faith entitled to procure the insurance through ordinary methods. A rate for a coverage is unfairly discriminatory in relation to another rate for the same coverage, if the differential between the rates is not reasonably justified by differences in losses, expenses, or both, or by differences in the uncertainty of loss for the individuals or risks to which the rates apply. A reasonable justification shall be supported by a reasonable classification system; by sound actuarial principles when applicable; and by actual and credible loss and expense statistics or, in the case of new coverages and classifications, by reasonably anticipated loss and expense experience. A rate is not unfairly discriminatory because the rate reflects differences in expenses for individuals or risks with similar anticipated losses, or because the rate reflects differences in losses for individuals or risks with similar expenses. Rates are not unfairly discriminatory if they are averaged broadly among persons insured on a group, franchise, blanket policy, or similar basis.

**Appendix A-1**

**History of Premiums, Market Shares, Loss Ratios and  
Best's Ratings of the Liquor Liability Insurance Market  
1980, 1981, 1982 & 1983**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Carrier Name</u>	<u>Written Premiums (\$1,000s)</u>	<u>Market Shares (%)</u>	<u>Loss Ratio (%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Carrier Name</u>	<u>Written Premiums (\$1,000s)</u>	<u>Market Shares (%)</u>	<u>Loss Ratio (%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1980	1.	Stonewall Insurance Co	4,047	38.08	179.59	B+	1982	1.	@Transit Casualty Co	1,236	23.56	211.20	A+
	2.	Capitol Indemnity Corp	2,308	21.72	31.53	C		2.	Progressive Cas Ins Co	1,001	19.08	69.94	A+
	3.	INA Underwriters Ins Co	1,962	18.46	44.38	NR-		3.	Stonewall Insurance Co	966	18.41	303.29	B+
	4.	Progressive Cas Ins Co	1,488	14.00	92.88	A+		4.	Insurance Co of North Am	717	13.67	1503.92	A
	5.	@American Universal Ins Co	217	2.04	773.88	A+		5.	Capitol Indemnity Corp	346	6.60	203.05	B
	6.	@American Druggists Ins Co	140	1.32	5.64	A+		6.	Northwestern Natl Cas Co	176	3.35	82.27	A+
	7.	Northwestern Natl Cas Co	104	0.98	32.96	A		7.	U. S. Liability Ins Co	161	3.07	3.26	A+
	8.	Western Caslty & Surety Co	104	0.98	143.02	A+		8.	Calvert Insurance Co	142	2.71	37.27	NR-
	9.	Michigan Mutual Ins Co	90	0.85	300.65	A		9.	Pacific Employers Ins Co	135	2.57	568.46	A
	10.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	58	0.55	29.72	A+		10.	Western Caslty & Surety Co	100	1.91	51.09	A+
	11.	Jefferson Ins Co of NY	37	0.35	0.00	A		11.	American Empire Ins Co	87	1.66	19.67	NR-
	12.	Continental Casualty Co	21	0.20	-37.21	A		12.	Home Insurance Co	48	0.91	45.96	A
	13.	Argonaut Midwest Ins Co	9	0.08	117.57	B		13.	INA Underwriters Ins Co	42	0.80	-297.31	A
	14.	Employers Ins of Wausau	8	0.08	0.00	A		14.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	35	0.67	49.74	A+
	15.	Argonaut Insurance Co	6	0.06	16.66	B		15.	Hartford Accdnt & Indem Co	25	0.48	126.53	A+
	16.	New Hampshire Insurance Co	5	0.05	13.80	A+		16.	Jefferson Ins Co of NY	9	0.17	-119.61	A
	17.	American Home Insurance Co	5	0.05	316.02	A+		17.	Continental Casualty Co	9	0.17	2.14	A
	18.	National Indemnity Co	5	0.05	21.62	A+		18.	Employers Ins of Wausau	7	0.13	0.00	A
	19.	Hartford Accdnt & Indem Co	3	0.03	0.00	A		19.	Argonaut Midwest Ins Co	4	0.08	187.12	B
	20.	Great Central Insurance Co	3	0.03	0.00	B+		20.	Argonaut Insurance Co	3	0.06	210.12	B
1981	1.	Stonewall Insurance Co	3,593	33.06	169.49	B+	1983	1.	CIGNA Insurance Co	1,097	42.57	97.74	NR-
	2.	Insurance Co of North Am	2,333	21.47	128.53	A		2.	Progressive Caslty Ins Co	552	21.42	114.43	A+
	3.	Progressive Caslty Ins Co	1,351	12.43	142.09	A+		3.	Capitol Indemnity Corp	514	19.95	1.93	C
	4.	@Union Indem Ins Co of NY	1,267	11.66	48.54	NR-		4.	@Transit Casualty Co	120	4.66	202.75	A
	5.	Capitol Indemnity Corp	717	6.60	155.54	C		5.	Calvert Insurance Co	82	3.18	180.48	NR-
	6.	INA Underwriters Ins Co	543	5.00	68.99	A		6.	Insurance Co of North Am	80	3.10	3366.04	A
	7.	Pacific Employers Ins Co	320	2.94	117.28	A		7.	Northwestern Natl Cas Co	53	2.06	-83.12	A+
	8.	U. S. Liability Ins Co	228	2.10	77.36	A+		8.	Transamerica Ins Co of MI	29	1.13	-69.67	A+
	9.	Northwestern Natl Cas Co	194	1.79	19.74	A+		9.	Aetna Life & Casualty Co	27	1.05	650.82	A
	10.	Western Caslty & Surety Co	128	1.18	148.35	A+		10.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	22	0.85	-19.33	A+
	11.	American Empire Ins Co	89	0.82	50.30	NR-		11.	Continental Casualty Co	14	0.54	118.29	A
	12.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	27	0.25	-42.23	A+		12.	Hartford Accdnt & Indem Co	11	0.43	-146.10	A+
	13.	Natl Union Fire Ins Co	13	0.12	0.00	A+		13.	City Insurance Company	10	0.39	339.53	A
	14.	Jefferson Ins Co of NY	11	0.10	452.11	A		14.	Jefferson Ins Co of NY	6	0.23	0.10	A
	15.	Hartford Accdnt & Indem Co	11	0.10	0.00	A+		15.	U. S. Liability Ins Co	3	0.12	5.83	A+
	16.	Employers Ins of Wausau	11	0.10	0.00	A		16.	Wausau Underwrtrs Ins Co	3	0.12	0.00	A
	17.	Argonaut Midwest Ins Co	7	0.06	106.47	B		17.	American Insurance Co	2	0.08	0.00	A+
	18.	National Indemnity Co	5	0.05	29.91	A+		18.	Employers Ins of Wausau	2	0.08	0.00	A
	19.	Sentry Ins A Mutual Co	4	0.04	0.00	A		19.	Westfield Insurance Co	2	0.08	0.00	A+
	20.	Argonaut Insurance Co	4	0.04	75.28	B		20.	Zurich Reins Co of NY	1	0.04	0.00	NR-

**Appendix A-2**

**History of Premiums, Market Shares, Loss Ratios and  
Best's Ratings of the Liquor Liability Insurance Market  
1984, 1985, 1986 & 1987**

Year	Rank	Carrier Name	Written Premiums (\$1,000s)	Market Shares (%)	Loss Ratio (%)	Best's Rating <sup>s</sup>	Year	Rank	Carrier Name	Written Premiums (\$1,000s)	Market Shares (%)	Loss Ratio (%)	Best's Rating <sup>s</sup>
1984	1.	CIGNA Insurance Co	2,142	42.87	139.07	A	1986	1.	Mount Vernon Fire Ins. Co	14,925	57.31	65.00	A+
	2.	Progressive Caslty Ins Co	901	18.03	145.53	A+		2.	s Columbia Casualty Co	10,208	39.20	16.94	A+
	3.	Capitol Indemnity Corp	562	11.25	6.13	C+		3.	s Am Empire Surplus Lns Ins	433	1.66	69.69	A
	4.	@Union Indem Ins Co of NY	462	9.25	137.48	NR-		4.	Northwestern Natl Cas Co	278	1.07	7.93	NA5
	5.	Insurance Co of North Am	409	8.19	591.90	A		5.	s United Capitol Ins Co	103	0.40	76.28	--
	6.	Northwestern Natl Cas Co	218	4.36	71.37	B+		6.	American Automobile Ins Co	51	0.20	0.00	A
	7.	Western Cas & Surety Co	95	1.90	200.94	A+		7.	Continental Casualty Co	44	0.17	0.00	A+
	8.	Transamerica Ins Co of MI	65	1.30	407.31	A+		8.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	29	0.11	360.63	A+
	9.	Aetna Life & Casualty Co	37	0.74	78.23	A		9.	s Western World Ins Co	22	0.08	98.99	A+
	10.	Calvert Insurance Co	29	0.58	1553.12	NR-		10.	Transcontinental Ins Co	12	0.05	24.76	A+
	11.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	15	0.30	-96.65	A+		11.	Capitol Indemnity Corp	6	0.02	185.46	B
	12.	Argonaut Insurance Co	15	0.30	120.06	A		12.	Wausau Underwrtrs Ins Co	5	0.02	0.00	A+
	13.	Travelers Insurance Co	12	0.24	0.00	A		13.	St Paul Fire & Mar Ins Co	1	0.00	0.00	A+
	14.	City Insurance Company	8	0.16	313.01	A		14.	s Scottsdale Insurance Co	1	0.00	50.83	A+
	15.	Continental Casualty Co	8	0.16	2.25	A+		15.	Sentry Ins of MI Inc	0	0.00	0.00	C+
	16.	Jefferson Ins Co of NY	7	0.14	0.00	B+		16.	Bituminous Casualty Co	0	0.00	0.00	B+
	17.	Argonaut Midwest Ins Co	4	0.08	1153.62	A		17.	Continental Insurance Co	0	0.00	0.00	A
	18.	Employers Ins of Wausau	3	0.06	0.00	B+		18.	Michigan Mutual Ins Co	0	0.00	0.00	A
	19.	Occidental Fire & Cas Co	1	0.02	0.00	C+		19.	Hartford Accdnt & Indem Co	0	0.00	0.00	A+
	20.	Wausau Underwrtrs Ins Co	1	0.02	0.00	B+		20.	Sentry Ins A Mutual Co	0	0.00	0.00	C+
1985	1.	@Texas Fire & Casualty Co	9,842	36.68	54.07	NR-	1987	1.	Mount Vernon Fire Ins Co	9,558	41.08	60.00	A+
	2.	s Mount Vernon Fire Ins Co	7,938	29.59	80.00	A+		2.	s Columbia Casualty Co	8,403	36.12	2.89	A+
	3.	s Columbia Casualty Co	6,938	25.86	2.44	A+		3.	North Pointe Ins Co	3,320	14.27	58.50	--
	4.	s Western World Ins Co	618	2.30	31.41	A+		4.	# Bowling Proprietors of MI	593	2.55	61.54	--
	5.	CIGNA Insurance Co	578	2.15	845.62	A		5.	Northwestern Natl Cas Co	319	1.37	25.98	NA3
	6.	Capitol Indemnity Corp	355	1.32	13.86	C+		6.	s St Paul Surplus Lns Ins Co	167	0.72	88.00	A
	7.	Northwestern Natl Cas Co	321	1.20	55.82	NR-		7.	Aetna Life & Casualty Co	167	0.72	6.84	A+
	8.	Liberty Mutual Ins Co	80	0.30	0.00	A+		8.	Continental Insurance Co	165	0.71	0.00	A
	9.	Angelina Casualty Co	43	0.16	2.81	A+		9.	American Automobile Ins Co	150	0.64	0.00	A
	10.	American Automobile Ins Co	30	0.11	0.00	A		10.	Continental Casualty Co	146	0.63	0.00	A+
	11.	Transamerica Ins Co of MI	28	0.10	11.54	A+		11.	Citizens Insurance Co	104	0.45	0.00	A+
	12.	National Surety Corp	16	0.06	0.00	A		12.	s Lexington Insurance Co	43	0.18	0.00	A+
	13.	Insurance Co of North Am	15	0.06	2185.11	A		13.	First Security Caslty Co	40	0.17	65.00	--
	14.	Continental Casualty Co	13	0.05	-150.19	A+		14.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	33	0.14	-105.13	A
	15.	Gibraltar Casualty Co	11	0.04	395.71	NR-		15.	Transcontinental Ins Co	25	0.11	13.51	A+
	16.	Northwestern Natl Ins Co	2	0.01	60.40	NR-		16.	National Surety Co	17	0.07	0.00	A
	17.	Westfield Insurance Co	2	0.01	0.00	A+		17.	Calvert Insurance Co	14	0.06	82.98	B
	18.	Employers Ins of Wausau	2	0.01	0.00	NR-		18.	Wausau Underwrtrs Ins Co	5	0.02	0.00	A+
	19.	Wausau Underwrtrs Ins Co	1	0.00	0.00	NR-		19.	Firemans Fund Ins Co	4	0.02	0.00	A
	20.	Sentry Ins of MI Inc	1	0.00	0.00	C+		20.	Great American Ins Co	2	0.01	0.00	A+



**Appendix A-3**

**History of Premiums, Market Shares, Loss Ratios and  
Best's Ratings of the Liquor Liability Insurance Market  
1988, 1989, 1990 & 1991**

Year	Rank	Carrier Name	Written Premiums (\$1,000s)	Market Shares (%)	Loss Ratio (%)	Best's Rating <sup>s</sup>	Year	Rank	Carrier Name	Written Premiums (\$1,000s)	Market Shares (%)	Loss Ratio (%)	Best's Rating <sup>s</sup>
1988	1.	North Pointe Insurance Co	10,519	33.88	57.83	NR-	1990	1.	North Pointe Insurance Co.	7,002	27.56	29.34	NA3
	2.	s Mount Vernon Fire Ins Co	7,661	24.68	18.64	A+		2.	# MLBA Lmt'd Liability Pool	5,853	23.04	26.55	--
	3.	s Columbia Casualty Co	4,697	15.13	62.16	A+		3.	First Security Caslty Co	4,602	18.11	87.91	--
	4.	# MLBA Lmt'd Liability Pool	4,114	13.25	110.40	--		4.	s Mount Vernon Fire Ins Co	2,398	9.44	56.51	A+
	5.	First Security Caslty Co	1,069	3.44	13.57	--		5.	s Columbia Casualty Co	1,949	7.67	62.00	A+
	6.	# Bowling Proprietors of MI	900	2.90	61.33	--		6.	# Bowling Proprietors of MI	704	2.77	2.42	NA2
	7.	a Sourceone Insurance Co	725	2.34	52.00	--		7.	s Northfield Insurance Co	588	2.31	9.96	A+
	8.	Citizens Insurance Co	372	1.20	0.00	A+		8.	Citizens Insurance Co	498	1.96	0.00	A+
	9.	s St Paul Surplus Lns Ins Co	329	1.06	62.84	A		9.	Northwestern Nat'l Cas Co	350	1.38	57.15	B+
	10.	American Insurance Co	157	0.51	0.00	A		10.	Reliance Insurance Co	250	0.98	0.00	A
	11.	Continental Insurance Co	153	0.49	53.31	A		11.	Transamerica Ins Co	224	0.88	2.24	A
	12.	Aetna Life & Casualty Co	71	0.23	-13.64	A		12.	s St Paul Surplus Lns Ins Co	208	0.82	-237.65	A
	13.	Northwestern Nat'l Cas Co	50	0.16	-84.79	NR-		13.	Firemans Fund Ins Co WI	201	0.79	0.00	A
	14.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	42	0.14	56.46	A		14.	Great Central Insurance Co	142	0.56	38.36	B+
	15.	Glens Falls Insurance Co	31	0.10	95.66	A		15.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	68	0.27	-4.74	A
	16.	St Paul Fire & Mar Ins Co	28	0.09	102.57	A		16.	St Paul Fire & Mar Ins Co	58	0.23	32.29	A
	17.	Mt. Airy Insurance Co	28	0.09	0.00	A		17.	Phoenix Insurance Co	54	0.21	115.03	A-
	18.	Home Indemnity Co	22	0.07	0.00	A-		18.	Calvert Insurance Co	52	0.20	1.51	A-
	19.	Liberty Mutual Ins Co	19	0.06	0.00	A		19.	United States Fire Ins Co	40	0.16	8.08	A-
	20.	s Am Empire Surplus Lns Ins	16	0.05	0.00	A		20.	Transcontinental Ins Co	38	0.15	21.60	A+
1989	1.	North Pointe Insurance Co	6,522	26.06	19.30	NA3	1991	1.	North Pointe Insurance Co	8,654	39.22	40.37	NA3
	2.	# MLBA Lmt'd Liability Pool	5,315	21.24	33.50	--		2.	# MLBA Lmt'd Liability Pool	3,483	15.79	36.11	--
	3.	s Mount Vernon Fire Ins Co	3,790	15.14	2.11	A+		3.	First Security Caslty Co	2,860	12.96	45.80	NA3
	4.	s Columbia Casualty Co	2,646	10.57	62.00	A+		4.	s Mount Vernon Fire Ins Co	2,306	10.45	58.62	A+
	5.	a Sourceone Insurance Co	2,312	9.24	51.99	--		5.	s Columbia Casualty Co	1,933	8.76	62.00	A+
	6.	First Security Caslty Co	1,146	4.58	26.79	--		6.	Citizens Insurance Co	700	3.17	0.00	A+
	7.	# Bowling Proprietors of MI	586	2.34	42.01	NA2		7.	# Bowling Proprietors of MI	685	3.10	50.27	NA2
	8.	s Northfield Insurance Co	579	2.31	0.00	A+		8.	Northwestern Nat'l Cas Co	613	2.78	-43.94	B+
	9.	Citizens Insurance Co	442	1.77	0.00	A+		9.	s St Paul Surplus Lns Ins Co	220	1.00	58.72	A+
	10.	s St Paul Surplus Lns Ins Co	344	1.37	28.13	A		10.	Great Central Insurance Co	203	0.92	27.96	A-
	11.	Firemans Fund Ins Co o WI	239	0.96	0.00	A		11.	Century Mutual Ins Co	48	0.22	0.00	NA7
	12.	American Automobile Ins Co	161	0.64	216.73	A		12.	s United States Fire Ins Co	47	0.21	0.00	A-
	13.	Great Central Insurance Co	128	0.51	3.28	B+		13.	St Paul Fire & Mar Ins Co	42	0.19	40.55	A+
	14.	Calvert Insurance Co	89	0.36	4.83	B+		14.	St Paul Mercury Ins Co	29	0.13	66.45	A+
	15.	# MUCC Lmt'd Liability Pool	76	0.30	59.67	--		15.	American Employers Ins Co	26	0.12	0.00	A-
	16.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	57	0.23	9.26	A		16.	Phoenix Insurance Co	21	0.10	25.22	A-
	17.	St Paul Fire & Mar Ins Co	53	0.21	84.44	A		17.	Mt. Airy Insurance Co	21	0.10	0.00	A-
	18.	Phoenix Insurance Co	34	0.14	0.00	A-		18.	Employers Ins of Wausau	20	0.09	0.00	A+
	19.	U. S. Fire Insurance Co	33	0.13	0.00	A		19.	Liberty Mutual Ins Co	19	0.09	0.00	A-
	20.	Mt. Airy Insurance Co	31	0.12	227.13	A		20.	Travelers Indemnity Ins Co	19	0.09	0.00	A-

**Appendix A-4**

**History of Premiums, Market Shares, Loss Ratios and  
Best's Ratings of the Liquor Liability Insurance Market  
1992, 1993, 1994 & 1995**

Year	Rank	Carrier Name	Written Premiums (\$1,000s)	Market Shares (%)	Loss Ratio (%)	Best's Rating <sup>s</sup>	Year	Rank	Carrier Name	Written Premiums (\$1,000s)	Market Shares (%)	Loss Ratio (%)	Best's Rating <sup>s</sup>
1992	1.	North Pointe Insurance Co	9,492	41.90	44.30	B+	1994	1.	North Pointe Insurance Co	9,844	47.16	35.87	B+
	2.	# MLBA Lmt'd Liability Pool	3,579	15.80	71.97	NA2		2.	# MLBA Lmt'd Liability Pool	2,357	11.29	-13.81	NA1
	3.	s Mount Vernon Fire Ins Co	1,931	8.53	63.00	A++		3.	s Columbia Casualty Co	1,736	8.32	-71.38	A
	4.	s Columbia Casualty Co	1,886	8.32	62.00	A		4.	First Security Casualty Co	1,576	8.55	54.16	NA3
	5.	First Security Caslty Co	1,302	5.75	46.85	NA3		5.	Empire Fire Marine Ins Co	903	4.33	62.49	A+
	6.	Calvert Insurance Co	861	3.80	23.67	A-		6.	s Mt. Vernon Fire Ins Co	683	3.27	50.00	A++
	7.	Citizens Insurance Co	753	3.32	249.99	A+		7.	Citizens Insurance Co of Am	667	3.20	124.79	A+
	8.	# Bowling Proprietors of MI	549	2.42	-25.97	NA2		8.	Continental Insurance Co	445	2.13	228.63	A-
	9.	Northwestern Nat'l Cas Co	542	2.39	35.94	B+		9.	Northwestern Nat'l Casualty	439	2.10	46.14	B+
	10.	s St. Paul Surplus Lns Ins Co	492	2.17	94.62	A+		10.	s St. Paul Surplus Lines Ins Co	404	1.93	-30.95	A+
	11.	Empire Fire & Marine Ins Co	331	1.46	.00	A+		11.	# Bowling Proprietors of MI	401	1.92	1.51	(6)
	12.	s United National Ins Co	204	.90	39.99	A+		12.	Calvert Insurance Company	386	1.85	48.21	A-
	13.	Great Central Insurance Co	159	.70	-44.23	A-		13.	s Homestead Insurance Co	115	.55	348.78	A-
	14.	Fireman's Fund Ins Co of WI	135	.60	-76.94	A		14.	s Illinois Emcasco Ins Co	107	.51	0.00	A
	15.	United States Fire Ins Co	67	.29	.00	A-		15.	North Am Specialty Ins Co	101	.48	42.80	A
	16.	St. Paul Fire & Mar Ins Co	47	.21	16.18	A+		16.	U. S. Fidelity & Guaranty	68	.32	158.63	A-
	17.	U. S. Fidelity & Grnty Co	46	.20	13.15	A-		17.	General Star Indemnity Co	67	.32	0.00	A++
	18.	National Surety Corporation	42	.19	.00	A		18.	Transcontinental Ins Co	63	.30	407.12	A
	19.	Reliance Insurance Company	35	.16	.00	A-		19.	s United National Ins Co	61	.29	-16.72	A+
	20.	St. Paul Mercury Ins Co	33	.14	64.19	A+		20.	Fidelity & Guaranty Ins Co	60	.29	64.60	A-
1993	1.	North Pointe Insurance Co	9,485	44.78	26.96	B+	1995	1.	North Pointe Insurance Co	9,381	48.11	20.35	B+
	2.	# MLBA Lmt'd Liability Pool	2,766	13.06	39.67	NA2		2.	# MLBA Lmt'd Liability Pool	1,844	9.46	.01	NA1
	3.	s Columbia Casualty Co	1,703	8.04	696.49	A		3.	First Security Casualty Co	1,655	8.49	26.48	(4)
	4.	s Mt. Vernon Fire Ins Co	1,459	6.89	55.00	A++		4.	s Columbia Casualty Co	1,322	6.78	-1120.71	A
	5.	Empire Fire & Marine Ins Co	999	4.71	4.10	A+		5.	Empire Fire & Marine Ins Co	917	4.70	147.10	A+
	6.	First Security Casualty Co	945	4.46	46.23	NA3		6.	s Mt. Vernon Fire Insurance Co	683	3.50	60.00	A++
	7.	Calvert Insurance Company	798	3.77	18.79	A-		7.	Citizens Insurance Co of Am	616	3.16	5.93	A+
	8.	Citizens Insurance Co of Am	608	2.87	-125.85	A+		8.	Star Insurance Company	534	2.74	28.96	A-
	9.	s St. Paul Surplus Lines Ins Co	500	2.36	132.61	A+		9.	Northwestern Nat'l Casualty	434	2.22	104.81	B+
	10.	Northwestern Nat'l Casualty	482	2.28	24.08	B+		10.	# Bowling Proprietors of MI	425	2.18	-1.18	(6)
	11.	# Bowling Proprietors of MI	424	2.00	80.87	NA2		11.	s St. Paul Surplus Lines Ins Co	314	1.61	-182.77	A+
	12.	s United National Ins Co	215	1.02	164.08	A+		12.	Calvert Insurance Company	231	1.18	84.57	A-
	13.	Continental Insurance Co	185	.87	172.16	A-		13.	U. S. Fire Insurance Co	228	1.17	7.38	A
	14.	United States Fire Ins Co	94	.44	0.00	A-		14.	s Illinois Emcasco Ins Co	111	.57	11.92	A
	15.	North Am Specialty Ins Co	77	.36	37.72	A		15.	Transcontinental Ins Co	90	.46	-86.32	A
	16.	Great Central Insurance Co	77	.36	183.61	A-		16.	U. S. Fidelity & Guaranty	87	.45	28.16	A-
	17.	Aetna Life & Casualty Group	51	.24	-8.84	A		17.	St. Paul Mercury Ins Co	73	.37	64.80	A+
	18.	U. S. Fidelity & Guaranty	42	.20	-35.40	A-		18.	Continental Insurance Co	66	.34	87.68	A-
	19.	Lincoln Insurance Company	40	.19	205.27	A		19.	Fireman's Fund Ins Co WI	60	.31	47.46	A
	20.	St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins Co	29	.14	183.29	A+		20.	Fidelity & Guaranty Ins Co	60	.31	14.93	A-

**Appendix C-1**

**REPORT ON LICENSEES**

**Report Date: 9/88**

<u>C o m p a n y N a m e</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1. North Pointe Insurance Company	4,893	27.5%	NA3
2. #MI Licensed Beverage Assn Ltd Liab Pool	3,105	17.5%	--
3. s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	2,759	15.5%	A+
4. @Bel-Aire Insurance Company	1,886	10.6%	--
5. s Columbia Casualty Company	1,007	5.7%	A+
6. Nat'l Union Fire Ins Co of Pittsburg, PA	456	2.6%	A+
7. First Security Casualty Company	361	2.0%	--
8. Insurance Company of North America	287	1.6%	A
9. Old Republic Insurance Company	286	1.6%	A
10. Federated Mutual Insurance Company	283	1.6%	A+
11. Citizens Insurance Company of America	225	1.3%	A+
12. Great Midwest Insurance Company	185	1.0%	NA3
13. a SourceOne Insurance Company	160	0.9%	--
14. Northwestern National Insurance Company	125	0.7%	NA4
15. American Motorists Insurance Company	124	0.7%	A+
16. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co	110	0.6%	A
17. #Bowling Proprietors of MI Ltd Liab Pool	107	0.6%	--
18. Northwestern National Casualty Company	100	0.6%	NA3
19. Calvert Insurance Company	97	0.5%	B
20. Firemen's Ins Co of Newark, NJ	97	0.5%	A
<b>Totals: (last value is sum at A- or better)</b>	<b>16,653</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	<b>31.7%</b>

**Report Date: 2/89**

<u>C o m p a n y N a m e</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1. North Pointe Insurance Company	4,856	27.3%	NA3
2. #MI Licensed Beverage Assn Ltd Liabty Pool	3,083	17.3%	--
3. s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	2,563	14.4%	A+
4. @Bel-Aire Insurance Company	1,953	11.0%	--
5. s Columbia Casualty Company	953	5.4%	A+
6. Nat'l Union Fire Ins Co of Pittsburg, PA	453	2.5%	A+
7. First Security Casualty Company	385	2.2%	--
8. a SourceOne Insurance Company	323	1.8%	--
9. Federated Mutual Insurance Company	313	1.8%	A+
10. Insurance Company of North America	291	1.6%	A
11. Old Republic Insurance Company	284	1.6%	A
12. Citizens Insurance Company of America	235	1.3%	A+
13. Great Midwest Insurance Company	180	1.0%	A+
14. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co	135	0.8%	A
15. American Motorists Insurance Company	131	0.7%	A+
16. Northwestern National Insurance Company	122	0.7%	NA4
17. #Bowling Proprietors of MI Ltd Liab Pool	115	0.6%	NA2
18. Northwestern National Casualty Company	105	0.6%	B+
19. Calvert Insurance Company	99	0.6%	B+
20. American Insurance Company	96	0.5%	A
<b>Totals: (last value is sum at A- or better)</b>	<b>16,675</b>	<b>93.7%</b>	<b>31.6%</b>

**Report Date: 1/90**

<u>C o m p a n y N a m e</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1. North Pointe Insurance Company	3,637	20.4%	NA3
2. #MI Licensed Beverage Assn Ltd Liab Pool	2,806	15.8%	--
3. @Bel-Aire Insurance Company	2,342	13.2%	NA3
4. s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	1,879	10.6%	A+
5. a SourceOne Insurance Company	1,616	9.1%	--
6. s Columbia Casualty Company	770	4.3%	A+
7. Nat'l Union Fire Ins Co of Pittsburg, PA	438	2.5%	A+
8. Citizens Insurance Company of America	353	2.0%	A+
9. Federated Mutual Insurance Company	346	1.9%	A+
10. Insurance Company of North America	314	1.8%	A
11. First Security Casualty Company	312	1.8%	--
12. s Northfield Insurance Company	289	1.6%	A+
13. Old Republic Insurance Company	283	1.6%	A
14. Fireman's Fund Insurance Company	170	1.0%	A
15. American Motorists Insurance Company	134	0.8%	A+
16. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co	125	0.7%	A
17. Northwestern National Insurance Company	121	0.7%	NA4
18. Northwestern National Casualty Company	117	0.7%	B+
19. Great Midwest Insurance Company	113	0.6%	NA3
20.# Bowling Proprietors of MI Ltd Liab Pool	113	0.6%	NA2
<b>Totals: (last value is at sum A- or better)</b>	<b>16,278</b>	<b>91.4%</b>	<b>28.7%</b>

**Report Date: 1/91**

<u>C o m p a n y N a m e</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1. North Pointe Insurance Company	4,447	25.1%	NA3
2. #MI Licensed Beverage Assn Ltd Liabty Pool	2,637	14.9%	--
3. a SourceOne Insurance Company	2,025	11.4%	--
4. s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	1,763	10.0%	A+
5. @Bel-Aire Insurance Company	914	5.2%	--
6. s Columbia Casualty Company	683	3.9%	A+
7. Citizens Insurance Company of America	477	2.7%	A+
8. First Security Casualty Company	476	2.7%	NA3
9. Federated Mutual Insurance Company	325	1.8%	A+
10. Nat'l Union Fire Ins Co of Pittsburg, PA	322	1.8%	A+
11. Old Republic Insurance Company	292	1.6%	A
12. Truck Insurance Exchange	265	1.5%	A
13. Reliance Insurance Company	205	1.2%	A-
14. Fireman's Fund Insurance Company	187	1.1%	A
15. American Commercial Liability Ins Co	147	0.8%	NA5
16. Hartford Casualty Insurance Company	140	0.8%	A+
17. American Motorists Insurance Company	136	0.8%	A+
18. #Bowling Proprietors of MI Ltd Liab Pool	135	0.8%	NA2
19. Northwestern National Casualty Company	134	0.8%	B+
20. Insurance Company of North America	129	0.7%	A
<b>Totals: (last value is sum at A- or better)</b>	<b>15,839</b>	<b>89.4%</b>	<b>27.8%</b>

**Appendix C-2**

**REPORT ON LICENSEES**

**Report Date: 1/92**

<u>C o m p a n y   N a m e</u>	<u>Licensees</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1. North Pointe Insurance Company	5,439	31.0%	NA3
2. First Security Casualty Company	2,551	14.5%	NA3
3. #MI Licensed Beverage Assn Ltd Liab Pool	2,091	11.9%	--
4. s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	1,473	8.4%	A+
5. s Columbia Casualty Company	799	4.5%	A+
6. Citizens Insurance Company of America	585	3.3%	A+
7. Natl Union Fire Ins Co of Pittsburg, PA	395	2.2%	A+
8. Truck Insurance Exchange	343	2.0%	A
9. Old Republic Insurance Company	293	1.7%	A
10. Federated Mutual Insurance Company	268	1.5%	A+
11. Northwestern National Casualty Company	225	1.3%	B+
12. Reliance National Insurance Co	219	1.2%	A-
13. Calvert Insurance Company	218	1.2%	A-
14. Fireman's Fund Insurance Company	176	1.0%	A
15. American Motorists Insurance Company	175	1.0%	A+
16. Hartford Casualty Insurance Company	141	0.8%	A+
17. #Bowling Proprietors of MI Ltd Liab Pool	135	0.8%	NA2
18. Great Midwest Insurance Company	135	0.8%	A-
19. Federal Insurance Company	122	0.7%	A+
20. American Commercial Liability Ins Co	115	0.7%	NA5
<b>Totals:</b> (last value is sum at A- or better)	<b>15,898</b>	<b>90.5%</b>	<b>30.4%</b>

**Report Date: 1/93**

<u>C o m p a n y   N a m e</u>	<u>Licensees</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1. North Pointe Insurance Company	5,856	33.5%	NA3
2. #MI Licensed Beverage Assn Ltd Liabty Pool	1,682	9.6%	--
3. First Security Casualty Company	1,522	8.7%	NA3
4. s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	1,281	7.3%	A+
5. s Columbia Casualty Company	943	5.4%	A+
6. Calvert Insurance Company	788	4.5%	A-
7. Citizens Insurance Company of America	552	3.2%	A+
8. Natl Union Fire Ins Co of Pittsburg, PA	427	2.4%	A++
9. Truck Insurance Exchange	343	2.0%	A
10. Empire Fire & Marine Insurance Company	294	1.7%	A
11. Northwestern National Casualty Company	286	1.6%	B+
12. Old Republic Insurance Company	269	1.5%	A
13. Reliance National Insurance Co.	239	1.4%	A-
14. Federated Mutual Insurance Company	218	1.2%	A
15. s St Paul Surplus Lines Insurance Company	210	1.2%	A+
16. American Motorists Insurance Company	177	1.0%	A
17. Fireman's Fund Insurance Company	165	0.9%	A
18. s Lincoln Insurance Company	165	0.9%	A-
19. Hartford Casualty Insurance Company	141	0.8%	A+
20. Great Midwest Insurance Company	135	0.8%	A-
<b>Totals:</b> (last value is sum at A- or better)	<b>15,693</b>	<b>89.8%</b>	<b>36.3%</b>

**Report Date: 1/94**

<u>C o m p a n y   N a m e</u>	<u>Licensees</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1. North Pointe Insurance Company	6,034	34.7%	B+
2. #MI Licensed Beverage Assn Ltd Liab Pool	1,364	7.8%	NA2
3. s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	1,156	6.6%	A++
4. First Security Casualty Company	1,151	6.6%	NA3
5. s Columbia Casualty Company	1,001	5.8%	A
6. Empire Fire & Marine Insurance Company	884	5.1%	A+
7. Calvert Insurance Company	612	3.5%	A-
8. Citizens Insurance Company of America	471	2.7%	A+
9. National Union Fire Ins Co of Pittsburg, PA	414	2.4%	A++
10. Northwestern National Casualty Company	296	1.7%	B+
11. Truck Insurance Exchange	292	1.7%	A
12. Old Republic Insurance Company	289	1.7%	A+
13. s St Paul Surplus Lines Insurance Company	282	1.6%	A+
14. Reliance National Insurance Co.	243	1.4%	A-
15. American Motorists Insurance Company	170	1.0%	A
16. National Surety Corporation	169	1.0%	A
17. s Homestead Insurance Company	163	0.9%	A
18. Federated Mutual Insurance Company	152	0.9%	A
19. Continental Insurance Company	142	0.8%	A
20. Federal Insurance Company	142	0.8%	A++
<b>Totals:</b> (last value is percent at A- or better)	<b>15,427</b>	<b>88.7%</b>	<b>37.8%</b>

**Report Date: 1/95**

<u>C o m p a n y   N a m e</u>	<u>Licensees</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>Best's Rating<sup>s</sup></u>
1. North Pointe Insurance Company	6,531	37.6%	B+
2. #MI Licensed Beverage Assn Ltd Liabty Pool	1,194	6.9%	NA2
3. First Security Casualty Company	1,112	6.4%	NA3
4. Empire Fire & Marine Insurance Company	937	5.4%	A+
5. s Columbia Casualty Company	879	5.1%	A
6. s Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	871	5.0%	A++
7. Citizens Insurance Company of America	458	2.6%	A+
8. National Union Fire Ins Co of Pittsburg PA	423	2.4%	A++
9. Calvert Insurance Company	337	1.9%	A-
10. Northwestern National Casualty Company	307	1.8%	B+
11. Old Republic Insurance Company	303	1.7%	A+
12. s St Paul Surplus Lines Insurance Company	252	1.5%	A+
13. Truck Insurance Exchange	252	1.5%	A-
14. Reliance National Insurance Co.	242	1.4%	A-
15. American Motorists Insurance Company	183	1.1%	A
16. National Surety Corporation	167	1.0%	A
17. Federal Insurance Company	162	0.9%	A++
18. Continental Insurance Company	152	0.9%	A-
19. Federated Mutual Insurance Company	152	0.9%	A
20. s Illinois EMASCO Insurance Co	147	0.8%	A
<b>Totals:</b> (last value is percent at A- or better)	<b>15,061</b>	<b>86.8%</b>	<b>34.1%</b>

## Appendix D - 1

### Michigan Liquor Licensee Insurance Providers

Code	Company Name	Date of Report:														
		9/88	2/89	1/90	1/91	1/92	1/93	1/94	1/95	1/96	1/97	1/98	1/99	1/00	1/01	
#	North Pointe Insurance Company	4,893	4,856	3,637	4,447	5,439	5,856	6,034	6,531	6,520	6,639	7,012	6,506	5,944	5,560	--
	Legion Insurance Company									106	953	1,063	1,158	1,130	1,253	-
	MI Licnsd Beverage Assn Ltd LP	3,105	3,083	2,806	2,637	2,091	1,682	1,364	1,194	1,074	985	943	901	857	784	-
	United States Liability Insurance Co													828	1,261	+++
	Nat'l Union Fire Ins Co of Ptsbg PA	456	453	438	322	395	427	414	423	668	692	671	825	817	721	
s	Citizens Insurance Company of Am	225	235	353	477	585	552	471	458	424	406	496	539	558	506	+
	Columbia Casualty Company	1,007	953	770	683	799	943	1,001	879	791	737	716	631	520	490	--
	Star Insurance Company							6	8	370	496	586	448	437	401	
	Reliance Insurance Company	3	4	5	205	13	14	13	8	7	41	312	335	323	33	
	Commercial Union Insurance Co	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	146	193	221	229	226	263	237	
s	Illinois EMASCO Insurance Co							27	147	149	153	184	222	257	18	+
	Northwestern National Casualty Co	100	105	117	134	225	286	296	307	317	271	245	218	196	206	-
	Argonaut Great Central Ins Co	87	81	78	68	82	63	40	20	31	31	62	119	178	210	+
	National Surety Corporation						5	169	167	168	171	172	178	176	174	
	Firemans Fund Insurance Company	38	44	170	187	176	165	65	59	63	74	88	143	159	110	
s	United States Fidelity & Grnty Co	110	135	125	98	90	77	67	69	70	75	183	158	158	358	
	Continental Casualty Company	73	73	71	104	102	104	101	83	87	99	137	145	136	128	
	American States Insurance Co.									12	24	53	81	133	113	++
	Lexington Insurance Company									2	14	38	126	132	114	
	Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Co										10	28	91	124	150	+
	American Motorists Insurance Co	124	131	134	136	175	177	170	183	182	179	113	114	121	127	
	American Manufacturers Mutual I C			7	8	7	5	6	4	24	24	2	2	117	127	++
	Mt Vernon Fire Insurance Company	2,759	2,563	1,879	1,763	1,473	1,281	1,156	871	650	613	579	689	114	38	---
	Safeco Insurance Co of America							1	7	59	83	172	149	114	60	-
	Bowling Proprietors of MI Ltd LP	107	115	113	135	135	120	122	120	126	126	135	118	112	100	
	Grocers Insurance Company										16	45	83	106	74	+
	Federated Mutual Insurance Co	283	313	346	325	268	218	152	152	178	155	122	97	105	108	
	Great Midwest Insurance Company	185	180	113	123	135	135	128	139	141	132	121	109	92	85	
	Agricultural Insurance Company											63	89	89	+	

## Appendix D – 2

### Michigan Liquor Licensee Insurance Providers

Code	Company Name	Date of Report:													
		9/88	2/89	1/90	1/91	1/92	1/93	1/94	1/95	1/96	1/97	1/98	1/99	1/00	1/01
	Reliance National Indemnity Co								21	43	47	38	38	86	82 +
333	Liberty Mutual Insurance Company	63	64	63	64	52	44	48	50	54	58	85	92	84	108
	Badger Mutual Insurance Company												6	77	171 ++
	Great American Insurance Company	8	5	4	0	0	0	6	31	38	45	31	92	76	61 +
	St Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co	38	39	60	79	62	98	90	70	71	71	71	73	76	104
	American Economy Insurance Co									18	28	27	36	71	104
	TIG Insurance Co (Transamerica)	2	3	11	21	37	89	88	84	84	76	49	43	70	90 +
	United States Fire Insurance Co	1	1	5	13	10	18	25	33	158	159	155	156	69	0 --
	Lake States Insurance Company										5	51	64	68	59
	Alfa Mutual Insurance Company												17	67	11 +
	Truck Insurance Exchange			31	265	343	343	292	252	216	116	65	62	66	53
	Northern Assurance Co of America								2	3	5	25	63	63	76
	Westport Insurance Company													62	32 ++
	Travelers Casualty & Surety Co											128	87	59	57 -
	American Country Insurance Co												4	59	130 +
	Travelers Cas & Surety Co of Am											3	48	58	70
	Federal Insurance Company	1	1	2	2	122	133	142	162	173	195	219	50	57	45
	American Casualty Co of Reading										1	0	52	52	51
s	United National Insurance Co			1	59	64	56	61	34	56	68	27	36	47	83
	Transcontinental Insurance Co				10	1	3	6	39	43	54	48	45	46	72
	Auto-Owners Insurance Company									24	39	39	42	45	68
s	Colony Insurance Company						27	94	77	57	51	58	56	43	29
	Indiana Insurance Company							11	23	27	36	41	42	43	23
	Penn-America Insurance Company										4	26	39	41	42
	Hartford Casualty Insurance Co	1	2	22	140	141	141	7	7	6	8	32	36	40	29
	Zurich Insurance Company	5	7	9	12	11	11	21	19	16	19	42	33	40	0
	Mutual Insurance Corp of America												36	38	30
	Ohio Casualty Insurance Company									1	0	2	18	36	47
	Gulf Insurance Company			2	11	13	30	29	25	13	8	4	1	33	48 +

### Appendix D - 3

#### Michigan Liquor Licensee Insurance Providers

Code	Company Name	Date of Report:													
		9/88	2/89	1/90	1/91	1/92	1/93	1/94	1/95	1/96	1/97	1/98	1/99	1/00	1/01
	General Accident Ins Co of Am						1	3	6	10	24	34	32	29	19
	Travelers Property & Cas Ins Co											6	17	29	26
	Ranger Insurance Company									0	21	44	65	28	0 --
	Transportation Insurance Company	29	30	30	30	35	39	40	40	37	6	26	42	23	15
	Fidelity & Guaranty Ins Undrwtrrs											1	15	22	27
	Continental Insurance Company	21	23	25	24	19	15	142	152	39	30	28	26	21	20
	Hamilton Mutual Ins Co of Cinn					6	28	30	37	48	43	35	23	20	13
#	MI Hi Ed Self Ins & Risk Mgt Fclty	11	12	14	17	17	17	18	18	18	18	18	19	20	18
	Special-Liability/> 1 Carrier	10	11	10	13	12	13	13	13	16	17	18	19	20	18
	Northern Insurance Co of NY									3	11	20	24	19	12
	Travelers Insurance Company	22	23	29	33	20	17	9	10	16	15	27	22	19	8
	Colorado Western Insurance Co								5	16	20	18	19	18	23
	United Pacific Insurance Company	4	4	4	4	3	8	13	13	13	15	17	19	18	9
	Mid-Century Insurance Company									4	9	8	14	18	15
	Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co												1	18	16
	Calvert Insurance Company	97	99	69	50	218	788	612	337	220	171	157	77	17	0 --
	Seneca Insurance Company, Inc.								2	0	3	13	22	17	14
	Farmers Insurance Exchange			17	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	5	13	17	19
	Globe Indemnity Company	1	0	1	4	1	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	17	1
	Fire & Casualty Ins Co of CT													17	27
	Fidelity & Guaranty Ins Co							1	12	19	24	27	27	16	9
	Twin City Fire Insurance Co(MN)				3	2	23	23	28	2	3	8	15	16	4
	Selective Insurance Company of SC											2	12	16	25
	Travelers Indemnity Co of IL	30	29	29	24	24	25	32	34	16	19	42	48	15	11 -
	Pharmacists Mutual Insurance Co						4	7	10	14	17	19	17	15	17
	American Home Assurance Co	8	8	5	5	5	7	8	8	9	11	13	13	15	89
	Voyager Indemnity Insurance Co												7	15	5
s	St Paul Surplus Lines Insurance Co	24	23	67	77	111	210	282	252	168	83	56	27	14	5
	American National Fire Ins Co							9	62	63	30	22	13	14	5

## Appendix D - 4

### Michigan Liquor Licensee Insurance Providers

Code	Company Name	Date of Report:													
		9/88	2/89	1/90	1/91	1/92	1/93	1/94	1/95	1/96	1/97	1/98	1/99	1/00	1/01
	Cincinnati Insurance Company	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	4	3	3	4	8	14	13
	Travelers Indemnity Company	37	30	29	5	5	7	7	7	8	10	26	27	13	9
	North River Insurance Company									1	1	52	54	12	9
	Hartford Fire Insurance Company	2	2	3	13	23	20	16	7	5	11	6	11	12	11
	Lumbermans Mutual Casualty Co			1	2	7	7	10	11	11	1	5	4	12	54
	Prime Syndicate, Inc.											8	16	11	19
	New Hampshire Insurance Co			2	4	6	6	10	19	53	16	17	15	11	10
	Great Nothern Insurance Company										1	3	9	11	5
	St Paul Guardian Insurance Co												2	11	14
	Travelers Casualty Company of CT											15	12	10	0
	Insurance Company of North Am	287	291	314	129	52	29	26	24	18	13	10	10	10	8
	Pacific Employers Insurance Co	3	3	2	2	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	12
	Cigna Insurance Company	8	17	48	46	31	21	9	4	2	2	3	8	10	8
	Employers Fire Insurance Company									1	1	6	4	10	10
	Farmland Mutual Insurance Co									23	40	35	39	9	9
s	Genesis Insurance Company										1	5	8	9	7
	State Automobile Mutual Ins Co									8	12	7	7	9	10
s	Frontier Pacific Insurance Co													9	1
	Michigan Mutual Insurance Co	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	17	18	16	8	8	8
	Selective Insurance Company of Am												6	8	10
	Employers Ins of Wausau, A Mut Co					1	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	8	18
	Massachusetts Bay Insurance Co							2	2	0	0	1	2	8	14
	American & Foreign Insurance Co					1	1	1	0	0	4	9	12	7	7
	Travelers Indemnity Co of America									2	6	12	11	7	7
*	Veritas Insurance Corporation	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	7
	St Paul Mercury Insurance Co						3	3	13	13	12	5	6	7	8
	State Auto Prop & Casualty Ins Co										2	2	6	7	5
	North American Specialty Ins Co						1	44	31	11	12	11	9	6	6
	American Alliance Insurance Co							6	17	12	18	16	7	6	2



## Appendix D - 5

### Michigan Liquor Licensee Insurance Providers

		<u>Date of Report:</u>													
<u>Code</u>	<u>Company Name</u>	<u>9/88</u>	<u>2/89</u>	<u>1/90</u>	<u>1/91</u>	<u>1/92</u>	<u>1/93</u>	<u>1/94</u>	<u>1/95</u>	<u>1/96</u>	<u>1/97</u>	<u>1/98</u>	<u>1/99</u>	<u>1/00</u>	<u>1/01</u>
	Hartford Ins Co of the Midwest									1	2	2	4	5	4
#	MI Municipal Risk Mangmnt Athty	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	4	3	5	5
	American Employers Insurance Co				2	2	4	3	4	5	6	2	3	5	9
	Home-Owners Insurance Company										1	0	3	5	1
	Northbrook Property & Cas Ins Co	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
	St Paul Property & Casualty Ins Co									3	4	4	4	4	1
	West American Insurance Company												0	4	5
	American Reliable Insurance Co											22	38	3	1 -
	Phoenix Insurance Company			1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	3	1
	Assurance Company of America								1	11	11	6	4	3	3
	General Insurance Co of America										2	3	4	3	1
	Cigna Fire Underwriters Ins Co			1	2	4	20	11	5	4	2	2	4	3	3
	Wausau Underwriters Insurance Co	1	1	12	11	10	9	0	7	7	7	8	3	3	4
	Commerce & Industry Insurance Co	1	1	2	2	0	0	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	1
	Cigna Property & Casualty Ins Co	2	2	7	7	8	6	4	3	2	2	2	3	3	1
	Zurich American Ins Co of IL												1	3	1
	Maryland Casualty Company								1	0	1	1	0	3	3
s	Mt Hawley Insurance Company					52	58	62	56	57	58	0	0	3	3
	Travelers Commercial Insurance Co											8	4	2	0
*	Lonepeak Insurance Company	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2
	AIU Insurnace Company							4	2	1	2	2	2	2	1
	Granite State Insurance Company	1	1	1	2	18	14	6	4	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co	8	21	0	28	36	31	30	24	3	2	2	2	2	0
#	MI Community College Risk Mgmt Athty										2	2	2	2	2
	Select Insurance Company					1	0	5	5	1	1	1	2	2	0
	Royal Indemnity Company	3	3	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	21	29	1	2	2
s	Scottsdale Insurance Company				1	3	5	6	1	2	1	0	1	2	5
	Executive Risk Indemnity Inc.													2	3
	General Casualty Co of Wisconsin													2	4

## Appendix D - 6

### Michigan Liquor Licensee Insurance Providers

Code	Company Name	Date of Report:													
		9/88	2/89	1/90	1/91	1/92	1/93	1/94	1/95	1/96	1/97	1/98	1/99	1/00	1/01
	Highlands Insurance Company													2	12
	Regent Insurance Company													2	3
	Farmington Casualty Company				1	0	0	11	23	32	36	32	15	1	0
	Gan National Insurance Company									1	19	15	11	1	0
	Frontier Insurance Company							4	1	0	0	4	4	1	0
	Century Indemnity Company								5	4	3	3	3	1	1
	Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co	37	35	32	21	14	11	10	7	5	3	3	3	1	3
	Bankers Standard Insurance Co	7	7	10	7	7	5	0	0	0	3	4	2	1	1
	American Insurance Company	92	96	14	7	4	3	1	2	1	4	2	2	1	1
	Underwriters Insurance Company										12	12	1	1	0
	Hanover Insurance Company			1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	4
	Nationwide Agribusiness Ins Co						1	7	16	11	11	1	1	1	1
	Secura Insurance, A Mutual Co									1	3	1	1	1	1
	Firemans Fund Insurance Co of WI			1	4	6	11	12	5	2	2	1	1	1	0
	Standard Fire Insurance Company		1	1	3	3	20	15	16	2	2	1	1	1	1
	Boston Old Colony Insurance Co						1	3	5	3	1	1	1	1	0
	Glens Falls Insurance Company					2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	0
	Reliance National Insurance Co.					219	239	243	242	2	1	1	1	1	1
	Vigilant Insurance Company										1	1	1	1	1
	Wausau Business Insurance Co											1	1	1	3
s	Reliance Insurance Company of IL									11	1	0	1	1	1
	Travelers Indemnity Company of CT									1	1	0	1	1	2
	Monroe Guaranty Insurance Co					1	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	Nationwide Property & Cas Ins Co						1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
#	MASB-SEG P&C Pool, Inc.												1	1	1
	Princeton Insurance Company												1	1	1
	Valley Forge Insurance Company												1	1	2
	Westfield Insurance Company												1	1	1
	National Fire Ins Co of Hartford													1	5

## Appendix D - 7

### Michigan Liquor Licensee Insurance Providers

Code	Company Name	Date of Report:													
		9/88	2/89	1/90	1/91	1/92	1/93	1/94	1/95	1/96	1/97	1/98	1/99	1/00	1/01
*	Travelers Casualty & Surety Co of IL											33	20	0	0
	AAI Syndicate #1 Ltd.									6	11	13	0	0	
	Acceptance Insurance Company							2	0	0	2	12	0	0	
<sup>s</sup>	Lloyds of London		1	0	0	4	0	0	8	50	50	15	7	0	0
<sup>s</sup>	Interstate Indemnity Company					21	21	44	60	60	25	6	2	0	0
	Vesta Insurance Company												2	0	0
	Royal Insurance Co of America	50	50	55	67	6	2	25	21	19	20	11	1	0	23
	Argonaut Insurance Company	12	12	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	American Agricultural Insurance Co												1	0	0
<sup>m</sup>	State Mutual Insurance Company						11	28	50	54	49	40	0	0	0
	American Modern Home Ins Co									4	44	16	0	0	0
*	Internat'l Casualty & Surety Co, Ltd.								2	82	20	14	0	0	0
	Buckeye Union Insurance Company					8	8	6	6	5	5	5	0	0	0
	Farm Bureau General Ins Co of MI								9	9	4	3	0	0	0
	Old Republic Insurance Company	286	284	283	292	293	269	289	303	309	288	1	0	0	0
	Allstate Insurance Company	8	8	9	10	18	18	5	1	1	1	1	0	0	3
@	First Security Casualty Company	361	385	312	476	2,551	1,522	1,151	1,112	1,005	809	0	0	0	0
<sup>m</sup>	Aetna Casualty & Surety Co	36	37	30	40	33	48	49	130	175	168	0	0	0	0
<sup>m</sup>	Aetna Casualty & Surety Co of IL	2	9	5	3	4	9	23	21	32	41	0	0	0	0
<sup>m</sup>	Aetna Commercial Ins Co									4	14	0	0	0	0
	National Farmers Union P & C Co									6	9	0	0	0	8
<sup>m</sup>	Aetna Casualty Co of CT									3	7	0	0	0	0
*	Alpine Assurance Ltd. (T & C Isles)									6	6	0	0	0	0
	Resure, Inc.										5	0	0	0	0
<sup>m</sup>	Aetna Casualty & Surety Co of Am									1	3	0	0	0	0
*	Regency Insurance Company, Ltd							32	31	15	3	0	0	0	0
	Home Insurance Company	15	16	18	14	4	4	4	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
<sup>s</sup>	T. H. E. Insurance Company								1	1	2	0	0	0	0
	Coregis Insurance Company									1	1	0	0	0	0

## Appendix D - 8

### Michigan Liquor Licensee Insurance Providers

Code	Company Name	Date of Report:													
		9/88	2/89	1/90	1/91	1/92	1/93	1/94	1/95	1/96	1/97	1/98	1/99	1/00	1/01
	Empire Fire & Marine Insurance Co						294	884	937	755	1	0	0	0	0
	Home Indemnity Company	48	48	50	52	35	3	2	3	3	1	0	0	0	0
*	United Community Insurance Co						1	8	5	5	1	0	0	0	0
@	American Commercial Liability Ins Co			63	147	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
s	American Empire Surplus Lines Ins Co	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
*	American Guarantee & Liab Ins Co	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
*	American Insurance & Indemnity Co	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
*	American Trust Insurance Co, Ltd	1	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Anatole Insurance Company Ltd				1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Arkwright Mutual Insurance Co	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Associated Indemnity Corporation								1	0	0	0	0	0	0
@	Avalon Insurance Company Ltd					5	46	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
@	Bel-Aire Insurance Company	1,886	1,953	2,342	914	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
#	Beverage Retailers Ins Co LLP	0	2	9	5	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
@	Cadillac Insurance Company	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Centennial Insurance Company	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Century Mutual Insurance Co.					93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Employers Casualty Company	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
*	Evergreen Indemnity, Ltd	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Fidelity & Casualty Co of NY (NH Grp)					16	16	12	12	12	0	0	0	0	0
*	Financial Casualty & Surety Ltd	4	5	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Firemens Ins Co of Newark, NJ	97	91	61	57	37	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
s	General Star Indemnity Company			46	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	General Star National Ins Co			2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
s	Homestead Insurance Company						8	163	55	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Illinois National Insurance Company									5	0	0	0	0	0
*	Institute of London Companies	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
*	Insurance Corporation of America	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	International Fidelity Insurance Co		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Appendix D - 9

### Michigan Liquor Licensee Insurance Providers

		Date of Report:													
<u>Code</u>	<u>Company Name</u>	<u>9/88</u>	<u>2/89</u>	<u>1/90</u>	<u>1/91</u>	<u>1/92</u>	<u>1/93</u>	<u>1/94</u>	<u>1/95</u>	<u>1/96</u>	<u>1/97</u>	<u>1/98</u>	<u>1/99</u>	<u>1/00</u>	<u>1/01</u>
<sup>s</sup>	Lincoln Insurance Company		28	44	0	25	165	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<sup>s</sup>	Lloyds of London-Lineslip #91NA					11	6	8	9	1	0	0	0	0	0
#	MI United Cons Club Lmt'd Liab Pool			4	11	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mutual Service Casualty Ins Co				1	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Nationwide Mutual Fire Ins Co	1	1	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Niagara Fire Insurance Company	3	4	2	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Northbrook National Insurance Co	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<sup>s</sup>	Northfield Insurance Company			289	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Northwestern National Insurance Co	125	122	121	127	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<sup>s</sup>	Nutmeg Insurance Company	25	24	27	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
@	Oxford Indemnity Insurance Co			6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Planet Insurance Company	77	76	77	74	77	83	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Protection Mutual Insurance Co	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RLI Insurance Company	16	27	28	28	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Sentry Insurance A Mutual Ins Co	42	25	25	26	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<sup>d</sup>	Sentry Insurance of MI, Inc.	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<sup>a</sup>	SourceOne Insurance Company	160	323	1,616	2,025	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<sup>s</sup>	Transamerica Specialty Ins Co			56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Travelers Insurance Company of IL	7	7	7	8	8	16	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Westchester Fire Insurance Co	2	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Licensees Totals		17,763	17,806	17,800	17,714	17,563	17,466	17,388	17,358	17,259	17,130	17,079	17,038	16,902	16,761
Admitted Company Totals		12,024	12,227	12,253	14,030	14,982	14,626	14,388	14,860	15,085	15,226	15,351	15,192	15,731	15,967
Percent of Total		67.7%	68.7%	68.8%	79.2%	85.3%	83.7%	82.7%	85.6%	87.4%	88.9%	89.9%	89.2%	93.1%	95.3%
Eligible Surplus Lines Total		3,818	3,595	3,179	2,741	2,563	2,780	2,940	2,450	2,055	1,857	1,684	1,806	1,151	794
Percent of Total		21.5%	20.2%	17.9%	15.5%	14.6%	15.9%	16.9%	14.1%	11.9%	10.8%	9.9%	10.6%	6.8%	4.7%
Ineligible SL and Unlicensed Captives		1,921	1,984	2,368	943	18	60	60	48	119	47	44	41	21	9
Percent of Total		10.8%	11.1%	13.3%	5.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Total Number of Carriers		92	93	101	102	105	109	115	125	141	159	153	170	174	225

**CERTIFICATION**

Based on the analysis and findings contained in this report, I certify that liquor liability insurance is reasonably available in Michigan at a reasonable premium.



---

Frank M. Fitzgerald  
Commissioner of Financial and Insurance Services

Date: May 4, 2001